DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 676 24 EA 004 404

AUTHOR Forsythe, Ralph A.; Keegan, John J., Jr.
TITLE The Development of Exemplary Performance Objectives and Their Attendant Evaluation Criteria for the Administrative Service Area of a School District. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Denver Univ., Colo.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-1-H-025
PUB DATE Jun 72
GRANT OEG-8-71-0021(509)
NOTE 136p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Principles; *Behavioral Objectives; *Educational Administration; Evaluation; *Evaluation Criteria; *Management Systems; Models; *Performance Specifications; School Community Relationship; Systems Approach

ABSTRACT

The procedures used in this study were designed to (1) identify the role of performance objectives in industry, (2) determine the importance of performance objectives at all levels of a school system, (3) identify the functions of the administrative service area of a school district, (4) construct the identified functions in terms of performance objectives and evaluation criteria, and (5) validate the constructed performance objectives and evaluation criteria. One hundred and nine tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria were developed of which 97 objectives were validated. Twelve criteria, because they were attendant to the nonvalidated objectives, were not validated. Study findings resulted in two major recommendations: (1) school districts instituting a system of management by objectives or PPBS should examine the exemplary performance objectives and evaluation criteria found in this study and adapt them to fit their particular situation, and (2) the technique utilized to develop the exemplary objectives and criteria should be employed by those school districts seeking to develop performance objectives and evaluation criteria for those functions described as administrative service functions.
(Author/RA)

ED 063676

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 1-H-025
Grant No. OEG-8-71-0021(509)

The Development of Exemplary Performance Objectives and Their Attendant Evaluation Criteria for the Administrative Service Area of a School District

Ralph A. Forsythe

and

John J. Keegan, Jr.

University of Denver
Denver, Colorado 80210

June 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EA 004 404

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
SUMMARY	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Research Methods and Procedures	1
Results	2
Conclusions	2
Recommendations	2
INTRODUCTION	2
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	6
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	7
Use of Objectives as a Management Tool	7
Functions of the Administrative Services	19
RESEARCH METHOD	21
Development of the Rating Instrument	21
Finalization of the Rating Instrument	21
Tabulation of the Juror Responses	23
JUROR RESPONSES TO THE PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE DIVISION	26
JUROR RESPONSES TO THE PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE RESEARCH AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT	35
JUROR RESPONSES TO THE PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS DEPARTMENT	57
JUROR RESPONSES TO THE PREFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE FACULTY-STAFF RELATIONS DEPARTMENT	82

Page

CONCLUSIONS 104

Conclusions Resulting from the Primary Purpose 104

Conclusions Resulting from the Secondary Purpose 116

RECOMMENDATIONS 117

DISCUSSION 117

CENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION 118

BIBLIOGRAPHY 119

APPENDIX A 125

APPENDIX B 127

APPENDIX C 130

SUMMARY

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to develop a set of exemplary performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria for the administrative service area of a school system. The secondary purpose of the study was to develop an administrative service area model for the construction of performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

Research Methods and Procedures

The procedures utilized in this study were designed to accomplish the following objectives: (1) identification of the role of performance objectives in industry; (2) determination of the importance of performance objectives at all levels of a school system; (3) identification of the functions of the administrative service area of a school district; (4) construction of the identified functions in terms of performance objectives and evaluation criteria; (5) validation of the constructed performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

The procedures developed to accomplish the five objectives were carried out in three phases. Phase I was the development of tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria. Phase II was the varification of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria. Phase III involved the recording and interpreting of the juror responses.

Phase I: The development of performance objectives and evaluation criteria. In Phase I the literature related to the role of performance objectives and the functions of the administrative service area was reviewed. From the review of literature the tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria which were to be included in the rating instrument were developed. These tentative objectives and criteria were refined through the use of a pilot jury before including them in the rating instrument.

Phase II: Validation of performance objectives and evaluation criteria. The jury technique was utilized to validate the tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria. In order to assure that the jury was comprised of experts in the field of administrative services and possessed a working knowledge of performance objectives the researcher identified four national experts in the field of school administration and planning-programming-budgeting systems. This was accomplished through a review of the literature both in the area of school administration and planning-programming-budgeting systems. The four experts who were identified were: Drs. Terry L. Eidell, Harry J. Hartley, Chester Kiser, and David Novick. All four experts were asked to identify six or seven potential jurors. Sixteen jurors were selected utilizing the above procedure.

Phase III: Recording and interpreting of the juror responses. The rating instrument was constructed so that jurors could mark each performance objective and each attandant evaluation criterion as either appropriate or not appropriate. On many of the objectives and criteria there were exception levels stated. The jurors were asked to choose one of the levels beyond which performance could not fall and still be considered acceptable.

Results

One hundred and nine tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria were developed. Of those objectives ninety-seven were validated. Twelve of the evaluation criteria were not validated because they were attendant to the non-validated objectives. Of the remaining ninety-seven criteria, ninety-two were validated.

Conclusions

Those objectives and evaluation criteria which were validated by the jurors became exemplary because of the fact that they had been validated. This fulfilled the primary purpose of the study. The secondary purpose of the study, that of developing a model, was also fulfilled since the technique used to develop the objectives and criteria were able to aid in the accomplishment of the primary purpose.

Recommendations

The recommendations which resulted from the findings and conclusions of the study were:

1. School districts that are instituting a system of management by objectives or PPBS should examine the exemplary performance objectives and evaluation criteria found in this study and adapt them to fit their particular situation.

2. The technique utilized to develop the exemplary objectives and criteria found in this study should be employed by those school districts seeking to develop performance objectives and evaluation criteria for those functions described as administrative service functions.

3. An additional study should be conducted which will rank the performance objectives in order of priority.

INTRODUCTION

A greater concern over educational expenditures and what has resulted from these expenditures has become more evident by the types of questions the public is asking educators. The public has begun to demand that educators become accountable. The educator has been forced to justify his decisions to a concerned public. This concern over educational expenditures and the results from these expenditures

has become so strong that state legislatures have begun to demand that educators account for their stewardship. Colorado, for example, has expressed its concern in the form of legislation. Two bills were passed and enacted into law in 1971 which require accountability on the part of school personnel. Senate Bill Number 33 entitled "Educational Accountability of 1971" and Senate Bill Number 42 entitled "Planning-Programming-Budgeting" both stressed the need for educational programs to be stated and evaluated in terms of pupil behavior. The Colorado Educational Accountability Act[1] has as its purpose the development of an accountability program which will define and measure quality in education and thus enable school patrons to determine the relative value of their school program as compared to its cost. In order that this purpose is accomplished it has become necessary for school personnel to identify broad educational goals and specific performance objectives which will aid in the accomplishment of these goals. California, Florida and Ohio have similar programs to help guarantee the accountability of their educators. Other states have been considering similar action.

The need for the development of performance objectives has been emphasized by another procedure which seeks the implementation of educational accountability. This procedure for educational accountability, that is being employed by some of the states, has been to force upon education, either by legislation or by executive order of the Governor, is a Planning-Programming-Budgeting System. At the time of the writing of this study, sixteen states had entered or were in the process of entering into some form of a Planning-Programming-Budgeting System.[2] Knezevich in his book Administration of Public Education says that:

> The complexity of educational operations, scarcity of resources, and growing public insistence on evidence of what results can be expected for increased fiscal inputs called for a new approach to relating educational inputs to outputs. PPBS is one way to relate resources to objectives. . .[3]

Characteristics of Planning-Programming-Budgeting. Berg has identified six basic characteristics to a PPB System.[4] The first

---

[1]"Educational Accountability Act of 1971" Section 1, Chapter 123, Colorado Revised Statues 1963, Article 41.

[2]Sam W. Bliss, The Extent and Utilization of Management Information Systems and Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems in State Educational Agencies (Denver Colorado: Improved Leadership Jr. Education, 1971), p. 16.

[3]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969), p. 435.

[4]Richard D. Berg, "Systems Help Educational Planning and Control," Journal of Systems Management (Vol. 21, No. 12, Issue 116. December 1971), p. 9.

characteristic of PPBS is setting of goals. These goals are determined by the needs of the agency. Objectives are formulated to meet these goals. The objectives are stated in terms that can be measured. Programs are then created that are defined as activities and specify the resources necessary to carry them out. Once these three steps have been completed, a budget is generated which attaches a cost to each program. Then the budget is projected over five years in order to estimate the future cost of a program. The program is put into operation and evaluations are made based upon the criteria established in the objectives.

Paramount to the successful operation of a PPB System is the development of behavioral or performance objectives. Banghart states that "the most difficult part of the entire systems study involves establishment of very specific objectives to be accomplished."[5] Berg believes that objectives must be developed immediately after the goals or needs of a community have been identified.[6] Hartley[7] lists the determination of operational objectives as the first step in PPBS.

All of the PPB Systems that have been developed for school districts consider performance objectives in approximately the same perspective as Banghart or Hartley. The Western New York (W.N.Y.) PPB System indicated that the selection of objectives as "paramount to the successful operation of the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System. . . ."[8] W.N.Y. also considered objectives as providing the guidelines for planning and for evaluation. Both the California model developed by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell,[9] and the CASEA[10] model place the establishment of objectives in the beginning of the program. CASEA indicated that the establishment of objectives was an on-going process through the entire system. The Association of School Business

---

[5]Frank W. Banghart, Educational Systems Analysis (Toronto, Ontario: MacMillian Company, 1969), p. 39.

[6]Berg, p. 11.

[7]Harry J. Hartley, Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 158.

[8]Chester Kiser and John Murphy, Program Budgeting (Buffalo: The Western New York School Study Council, October 1968), mimeographed.

[9]Conceptual Design for a Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (California State Department of Education), p. 2.

[10]Terry L. Eidell and John M. Nagle, Program Planning Document for Data-Based Educational Planning Systems (Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1970), mimeographed.

Officials (ASBO)[11] project ERMD listed the identification and selection of objectives as steps 2 and 3 in their PPBS project.

While PPBS has brought the need for performance objectives to the forefront for education, industry has been using performance objectives as a part of the total management system. Lopez[12] says that the use of goals by private industry is more commonly known as "Management by Objectives" while in government management by objectives is known as a "Planning-Programming-Budgeting System."

In discussing management by objectives, George Odiorne states that objectives "provide for the maintenance and orderly growth of the organization by means of statements of what is expected of everyone involved and measurement of what is actually achieved."[13] Another advantage of management by objectives, as described by Odiorne, has been the system's ability to extend from the top supervisors down to staff and technical personnel. Bittel[14] indicates that by stating a manager's tasks in performance objectives much of the prejudice has been removed from performance appraisals.

It therefore seemed appropriate that a study should be conducted that would develop exemplary performance objectives and evaluation criteria for school districts seeking to meet the public's demand for accountability.

Current state of performance objectives. To make it possible for education to reap the full benefits of PPBS and to be accountable for their educational programs, it will be necessary for education to determine more exactly what its goals are and how to determine when they are reached. Before these ultimate goals are reached, those involved in education must set specific objectives for themselves in conjunction with the broad general goals of education. There has been a great deal of work done in establishing instructional objectives. A preliminary review of the literature revealed many books detailing the techniques to be employed in writing instructional objectives and also books containing instructional objectives for each subject area. Bloom[15]

---

[11] Charles W. Foster, (ed.), Report of the First National Conference on PPBS in Education (Chicago: Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Offices, 1969), p. 47.

[12] Felix M. Lopez, "Accountability in Education" Kappan, Vol. III, Number 4, December 1970.

[13] George Odiorne, Management by Objectives (New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1965), p. 54.

[14] Lester R. Bittel, Management by Exception (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), p. 10.

[15] Benjamin S. Bloom, (ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1966).

Kibler,[16] Mager,[17] and Popham[18] have written books on how to develop behavioral objectives for the instructional area of a school district. Flannagan[19] has also developed specific objectives for all of the subjects K-12 in the instructional area of a school district. Under the directorship of Marvin Alkin,[20] the Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA has developed instructional objectives for all subject areas from kindergarten through twelfth grade. In 1971 the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Denver[21] concluded a project to develop performance objectives for the business service areas of a school district. The only area where efforts to develop performance objectives was lacking was the administrative service area.

This study was conducted, therefore, to fill the void that existed in the administrative service area. Because of the great emphasis upon Planning-Programming-Budgeting for the public schools it was decided that the performance objectives developed through the study would be readily adaptable either by those school districts which were entering into program budgeting and/or by those districts seeking a more objective method of judging administrative performance.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this study was to develop a set of exemplary performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria for the administrative service area of a school system. The secondary purpose of the study was to develop an administrative service area model for the construction of performance objectives and evaulation criteria.

---

[16] Robert J. Kibler, et.al., Behavioral Objectives and Instruction (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970).

[17] Robert F. Mager, Preparing Instructional Objectives (Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962).

[18] W. James Popham and Eva L. Baker, Establishing Instructional Goals (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

[19] John C. Flannagan, William M. Shaner, and Robert F. Mager, Behavioral Objectives: Languages Arts, Science, Social Studies, Mathematics (Palo Alto: Westinghouse Learning Press, 1971) four volumes.

[20] Marvin C. Alkin, et.al., Instructional Objectives Exchange (UCLA: The Center for the Study of Evaluation, June 1966).

[21] Thomas S. Crawford, The Development of a Model Exemplifing Business Services Objectives and Their Performance Indicators for Educational Program Budgeting (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Denver, 1971).

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of the review of literature was to provide the necessary information and techniques for developing performance objectives and evaluation criteria for the administrative services. In order to accomplish this purpose, the review of literature focused upon the following topics: (1) the use of objectives as a management tool; and (2) the functions of the administrative service area.

Use of Objectives as a Management Tool

The purpose of this portion of the review of literature was to examine the use of performance objectives as a management tool. In order to accomplish this purpose, literature from two sources was utilized: (1) a review of the management technique known as "Management by Objectives;" and (2) a review of the role of performance objectives in the different educational planning, programming, budgeting systems (PPBS).

Management by Objectives. The term, "Management by Objectives," was used first by Peter Drucker in his book Practice of Management. Since 1954, when the term first appeared, it has become a fairly well known term in modern management. The term which Drucker developed was used by him to explain his method for developing an efficient organization. It was Drucker's theory that for an organization to function efficiently the manager must understand specifically what he contibutes to the organization as a whole. Therefore, Drucker said that in order for the manager to function effectively he "must know and understand what business goals demand of him in terms of performance. . . ."[22] Drucker expanded upon this idea when he indicated that the manager was to be judged on his performance and how that performance contributed to the goals of the organization. Developing this idea Drucker said that the objectives of the manager should

> . . . lay out what performance the man's own managerial unit is supposed to produce. They should lay out what contribution he and his unit are expected to make to help other units obtain their objectives. Finally, they should spell out what contribution the manager can expect from the units toward the attainment of his own objectives.[23]

The system of management which Drucker described focused its attention on a product and judged a manager's performance in terms of his contibution to that product.

---

[22]Peter Drucker, The Practice of Management (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954), p. 121.

[23]Drucker, p. 126.

George Odiorne identified the key to "Management by Objectives" when he stated that "our environment now dictates the adoption of a more compelling kind of business leadership--the kind of leadership that will restore to the individual manager his personal risk for loss or gain."[24] What Odiorne called for by this statement was some form of accountability. The manager was to be measured by what he produced.

The use of objectives by companies was the central idea behind Humble's[25] book Management by Objectives in Action. He felt that companies should set objectives and analyze key results in terms of these objectives. The purpose for using objectives was to aid the manager in performing the task of control. By the use of objectives the manager was able to focus his energies on the important tasks which had been set down in the form of objectives. The use of objectives as an analytic technique, Humble indicated,

> . . . is a useful way to get each manager to analyze his key tasks, performance standards, and control information, and to suggest ways in which all these could be improved.[26]

Odiorne viewed the system of management by objectives

> . . . as a process whereby the superior and subordinate managers of an organization jointly identify its common goals, define each individual's major areas of responsibility in terms of the results expected of him, and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contibution of each of its members.[27]

Bendix Corporation instituted a system of management by objectives because the system was built upon the philosophy that the individual's performance directly affects the survival and prosperity of the company.[28] Drucker,[29] Humble,[30] and Odiorne[31]

---

[24]George S. Odiorne, Management by Objectives (New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1965), p. 53.

[25]John W. Humble (ed.), Management by Objectives in Action (Maidenhead, Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill, 1970), p. 6.

[26]Humble, p. 8.

[27]Odiorne, pp. 55-56.

[28]Management Development Committee, Setting Management Goals and Objectives, Aerospace Systems Division, Bendix Corporation, 1967. (mimeographed), p. 3.

[29]Drucker, p. 126.

[30]Humble p. 8.

[31]Odiorne, P. 56.

emphasized the point that management by objectives was a total management system. The major emphasis of the system was on the interrelationship between the parts. Each part depended upon the other for the successful completion of its own specific tasks. The system integrated the company's goals of profit and growth with those of the individual. The system functioned in such a way that the individual was not lost in the corporation but was an integral part of it.

Using the rationale that the duty of management is to aid individuals in performance of their tasks and thus enable the organization to meet its goals Mansergh defined "Management by Objectives" as

> . . . a managerial method whereby the supervisor and subordinate managers in an organization identify major areas of responsibility in which each will work, set some standards for good (or bad) performance, and measure the results against those standards.[32]

In the business world Odiorne said that the use of management by objectives would result in "better morale, more promotable people, improved quality of service and improved delegation of decision making."[33] In the field of education Mansergh explained that management by objectives aided in solving such problems as: (1) defining what is expected of people; (2) obtaining teamwork to meet common goals; (3) recognizing progress through the use of clearly defined goals and the measurement of accomplishment against these goals; (4) aiding in salary administration by basing raises upon performance; and (5) assisting in the promotion process by identifying individuals with potential.[34]

Valentine defined a performance objective as "a statement describing the conditions what will exist when a key area of a job is being done well."[35] The purpose of the performance objectives was for appraisal of performance, motivation to perform better, and improvement of superior subordinate relationship.

Humble defined a performance objective as a statement of the conditions which exist when the result was achieved.[36] The objective defined the product or end result.

---

[32]Gerald G. Mansergh, Dynamics of Management by Objectives for School Administration (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc. 1971), p. 28.

[33]Odiorne, p. 56. [34]Mansergh, p. 28.

[35]Raymond Valentine, Performance Objectives for Managers (New York: American Management Association, 1966), p. 40.

[36]Humble, p. 8.

The Bendix Corporation indicated that a performance objective specified the target or results that a manager was expected to achieve.[37]

Most of the authorities in the field of management by objectives identified different types of objectives. Each type that was identified had a different function which aided the organization in reaching its broad goals.

Valentine divided performance objectives into two types: (1) direct objectives, and (2) indirect objectives. A direct objective referred to tasks where performance can be measured directly and quantitatively. The person whose duty it was to evaluate performance was able to observe the results and to number them. The indirect objective pertained to the manager and his managerial skills.[38]

Odiorne identified four types of objectives: (1) routine objectives, (2) emergency objectives, (3) creative objectives, and (4) personal development objectives.[39] What Odiorne described as routine and emergency objectives, Valentine called direct objectives. Whereas the indirect objectives of Valentine were the creative and personal objectives of Odiorne.

The system of management by objectives has been described as a total management system. Bittel,[40] Odiorne[41] and others have stressed that if the system was to operate to its full potential it would be necessary for it to be instituted through the whole organization. Bittel described the structure of the system as being much like an organizational chart. The top level was the broad goals of the organization followed by objectives at the operational level. These objectives were short term and very specific. At the third level of disaggregation was found the specific objectives for the managers. These objectives were tailored specifically for the individual manager. At this level, the performance objectives were designed to describe the tasks that the individual managers were to perform.

Research indicated that before management by objectives could be implemented fully it would be necessary for objectives to be developed at each level. Odiorne[42] emphasized that this process of setting objectives can not be done by one person. For the system to operate at its full potential it was necessary for the manager and the person who would evaluate him to agree upon the objectives which the manager was to meet. Bendix[43] in their training manual for

---

[37]Bendix, p. 7. [38]Valentine, p. 52. [39]Odiorne, p. 102.

[40]Lester R. Bittel, Management by Exception (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), p. 63.

[41]Odiorne, p. 68 [42]Odiorne, p. 70. [43]Humble, p. 119.

writing objectives bore this out. The Bendix manual developed five basic steps necessary for the development of performance objectives. The steps were: (1) identify specific goals; (2) establish means of implementing the goals; (3) negotiate a detailed plan for the accomplishment of the objectives; (4) check progress at significant milestones; (5) measure accomplishment against the agreed upon goals.

Humble[44] took the same approach as the Bendix manual but utilized only four steps for the purpose of determining objectives. These four steps were: (1) identify key areas of the job and its key tasks; (2) set performance standards; (3) determine a method of checking performance which was satisfactory to both parties; (4) make suggestions for improvement of performance where possible.

With one exception, the work done by Bittel tended to follow that of Odiorne, Bendix and Humble. Bittel stressed that it was necessary "that for every projected goal you must also establish limits of tolerance."[45] In order to establish this tolerance or exception it was necessary to do four things: (1) determine the degree of exception permitted; (2) determine the duration of the variation; (3) determine the level of authority and responsibility necessary to deal with the problem which was identified in steps one and two; and (4) predetermine alternate courses to be taken where the minimum accomplishment has not been met.

All of the research which the author examined for this study indicated that when developing performance objectives the accomplishment level of the objective should be stated, whenever possible in quantifiable terms. If this was impossible then "a verbal description of the ideal condition and permissible variations"[46] should be included.

The major elements of any management by objectives system were identified by Odiorne as:

> 1. The manager assumes responsibility for identifying the common goals which all his subordinates share with him and toward whose achievement they must converge their combined talents.
> 2. Each person is able to state, in advance of the attempt, areas of responsibility and measures of acceptable results for his position.
> 3. Each person has knowledge of the goals he is to achieve, has worked out a plan for achieving them and is measured by his results, insofar as these can be attributed to conditions under his own effective control.[47]

The results that an organization would achieve by installing management by objectives so that the major elements functioned properly

---

[44]Humble, p. 119. [45]Bittel, p. 99. [46]Odiorne, p. 105.

[47]Odiorne, p. 61.

have been summarized by Valentine. These results were: (1) better understanding of responsibility; (2) more agressive action directed toward accomplishment of the objectives; (3) better understanding of the relationship between the organization's goals and the manager's personal goals; (4) more of a chance to create an atmosphere which expected exceptional performance; and (5) more opportunity for managers to operate with a great deal of independence.[48]

Performance objectives in a PPB System. This section was concerned with three aspects of performance objectives and PPBS. First, the role of objectives in a PPB System as it was described in PPB theory was examined. Second, an examination of the role of objectives in a selected number of operational models was conducted. Finally, the procedures for setting objectives for a PPB System were examined.

In defining a PPB System Hartley emphasized that a program budget dealt with "outputs, cost-effectiveness methods, rational planning techniques, long-range objectives and analytical tools for decision making."[49]

Mushkin and Cleaveland viewed a PPB System in much the same way as Hartley. They stressed the fact that the system provided more information for the developing of plans and the making of choices which strengthen the possibility of meeting the stated objectives.[50] PPBS was viewed by one author as

> . . . an integrated system that provides school executives with better information for planning educational programs and for making choices among the alternate ways in which funds can be allocated to achieve the school district's established objectives.[51]

Knezevich mentioned that PPBS was a new management system for education. The twofold purpose behind the implementation of the system was to (1) aid in the decision making process and (2) enable school administrators to present to the public the evidence which

---

[48]Valentine, p. 57.

[49]Harry J. Hartley, Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968), p. 76.

[50]Selma J. Mushkin and James R. Cleaveland, "Planning for Educational Development in a Planning, Programming, Budgeting System," Proceedings of the Eleventh National Conference on School Finance (Dallas, 1968), p. 61.

[51]Joseph A. Perkins, Jr., "PPBS and MIS: Their Role in Managing Education," Proceedings of the Twelfth National Conference on School Finance (New Orleans, La., 1969), p. 124.

they are demanding concerning the accomplishment of the educational programs in relation to their cost. The utilization of a PPB System enabled administrators to allocate resources to specific objectives.[52]

The theorists all indicated that PPBS has a specific relationship to objectives. Perkins[53] stated that a PPB System was designed to enable each school district to review objectives. In developing a PPB System the theorists placed the defining of tasks in terms of specific performance objectives at different points in the PPBS cycle. Hartley,[54] in his book Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting, listed the determination of operational objectives as the first step in a PPB System. Berg[55] placed the development of performance objectives immediately after the goals or after the needs of the community had been identified.

Perkins[56] felt that objectives were the desired quantifiable outcomes of a program and that both the objectives and the programs were to relate to the district goals. The objectives were to be developed after the goals had been identified from the needs of the community. While Perkins identified the establishment of objectives as the third step in implementing a PPB System, Mushkin stated that the first step in preparation of the system was "clarifying and specifying the ultimate goals or objectives of each activity for which a government budget gets money."[57] Mushkin indicated later in the same article that the defining of objectives provides answers to such questions as "What needs doing and for whom? and Why is each activity currently performed being performed?"[58]

Dorsey felt that the role of objectives was so important in a PPB System that he said that only after the objectives have been defined could the programs be structured.[59] Related to the idea that programs can not be structured and set up without first determining the objectives Silberman in Crisis in the Classroom criticized education and educators for this very thing. He observed

---

[52]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969), p. 435.

[53]Perkins, p. 125. [54]Hartley, p. 158.

[55]Richard D. Berg, "Systems Help Educational Planning and Control," Journal of Systems Management (Vol. 21, No. 12, Issue 116, December 1971), p. 9.

[56]Perkins, p. 125. [57]Mushkin, p. 61. [58]Mushkin, p. 62.

[59]John W. Dorsey, "An Overview of Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems," Proceedings of the Twelfth National Conference on School Finance (New Orleans, La., 1969), p. 137.

that the managers of education were not asking what the organizational goals were and had not even attempted to define them.[60]

Silberman's observation concerning the lack of organizational goals in education was a statement of fact. However, Knezevich pointed out that:

> The most difficult problem likely to be encountered in implementing PPBS in education is the translation of often vague and general statements of educational objectives into operational terms. Defining with clarity what constitutes an "educated" or "productive" person is a major task.[61]

Alioto further defined the importance of objectives when he stated that:

> In a PPB System statements of objectives provide guidelines for both planning and evaluation. Objectives may serve to facilitate the setting of priorities because they provide the specific expectations on which judgements of relative importance are made.[62]

An objective according to Alioto consisted of something toward which effort or energy and resources was directed. Using this concept as a foundation he identified three types of objectives: (1) philosophical objectives or goals, (2) instructional program objectives, and (3) support service program objectives. Alioto identified three approaches for the development of objectives. The first method was to develop the objectives based upon a needs assessment. This method of development insisted upon the needs assessment being conducted before the objectives could be developed. The second method was the use of existing data. Objectives were developed for the school based upon what was already known. This method saved a district time in implementing a PPB System but could lead to the entrenchment of the status quo. The third method mentioned by Alioto was that of brainstorming objectives. This method focused upon what one wants to accomplish as opposed to simply describing the existing system in terms of performance objectives.[63]

The role of objectives was reviewed in a selected number of operational PPB models. The models used in this section were those

---

[60] Charles Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 507.

[61] Stephen J. Knezevich, (ed.), Administrative Technology and the School Executive (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969), p. 76.

[62] Robert F. Alioto and J.A. Jungherr, Operational PPBS for Education (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971), p. 51-52.

[63] Alioto, pp. 54-60.

which were identified in the Crawford study as significant PPB models.[64] The following projects were identified in the Crawford study: (1) The Research Corporation of the Association of Business Officials (RCASBO), (2) Project 5001, Center for the Advanced Study of Education Administration (CASEA), (3) the state of California project, (4) Governmental Studies Center, Fels Institute of Local and State Government, University of Pennsylvania (Fels), (5) The Western New York School Development Council Project, (WNYSDC).

1. RCASBO. The Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Officials designed a PPB System commonly known as Educational Resources Management System (ERMS). The purpose of this system was to develop a conceptual design for an integrated system of planning, programming, budgeting, and evaluation.[65] The system was implemented in the Dade County School System on a pilot basis.

The RCASBO system defined planning as the "process of guiding internal change so that the school adapts effectively to the dynamic society of which it is a part."[66] An integral part of the planning process as was detailed in the ERM System was the identification of program objectives based upon the goals of a school system. The process utilized in developing the objectives included the following six step approach: (1) establishing, organizing and/or modifying task forces for planning; (2) identifying needs, problems and resources; (3) identifying and selecting goals; (4) developing tentative general objectives and identifying potential programs; (5) adapting goals, general objectives and programs, and; (6) adjusting for new information.[67] The role of performance objectives was considered primary in the RCASBO model. Objectives were needed for the evaluation component to operate. In order for the plans and programs to be effectively evaluated it was necessary that the objectives be stated as specifically as possible in terms of the expected end results. Modifications of the objectives were to be made as the plans and programs progressed through time.

---

[64]Thomas S. Crawford, "The Development of a Model Exemplifying Business Services Objectives and Their Performance Indicators In Educational Program Budgeting" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Denver, 1971), p. 18.

[65]"Proposal for Developing Program-Planning-Budgeting-Evaluation System Design," a proposal for research and related activities submitted to the Office of Education by the Dade County Public Schools and the Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Officials.

[66]William H. Curtis, Educational Resources Management System (Chicago: Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Officials, 1971), p. 45.

[67]Curtis, p. 46.

2. CASEA. The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration developed a six phase approach to aid in the implementation of a PPBS. Phases one and two dealt with the developing of a program cost accounting system and the manipulation of the data in the system. Phase three identified specific objectives for the programs or activities which were identified in Phase one. Phase four was the identification of the broad goals of the organization. Phase five was a meshing of the broad goals and the specific program objectives. Phase six was described as the ultimate in which the system was in complete operation and continually renewing itself. The CASEA approach to a PPB System was developed in such a way that the system could be begun at any one of the phases or at more than one phase at the same time.

Phase three was the phase in the CASEA approach which dealt with defining objectives for the different programs. Eidell and Nagel stated that Phase three was where school district personnel began "to develop the ability to define objectives, generate alternatives, make choices"[68] and make evaluations based upon the objectives. The CASEA project emphasized the point that goals and objectives were continually revised and redefined based upon the comparison of the desired state (defined by the objective) with the actual state (what resulted at the end of the program).

3. California. The California operational model of a PPB System was developed by Peat, Marwick and Mitchell. In the California system objectives were designed for use in program evaluation and the analysis of performance. Another purpose or role of performance objectives was to aid in the communication process between the levels of a school system.[69]

4. Fels. The PPB System developed at the Government Studies Center, Fels Institute identified the determining of the objectives of the organization and ways of measuring or estimating progress toward these objectives as one of the major focuses of the system. The developers of the system stated that:

> Both objectives and programs may be thought of as hierarchies proceeding from the most general to the most specific. The degree to which these hierarchies of objectives and programs are defined depends mainly on the size of the organization. . . .[70]

---

[68] Terry L. Eidell and John M. Nagle, Program Planning Document for Data-Based Educational Planning Systems (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1970), p. 5.

[69] Conceptual Design for a Planning, Programming, Budgeting System for California School Districts (Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, 1969), pp. 1-2.

[70] General Design for an Education Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (Philadelphia: Government Studies Center of the Fels Institute of Local and State Government, University of Pennsylvania, 1969), p. 4.

5. WNYSDC. Kiser described performance objectives as statements upon which the school district's activities and resource allocation focus. Dr. Kiser stated further that:

> Defined goals and objectives are needed in a PPB System. There are no universal statements of goals or objectives that would apply to any one school district. The process of determining objectives, although very time consuming, can be beneficial to school district officials for planning and decision making purposes. The exact nature of the statement of objectives is not as important as is the need for a clear understanding of the intent and meaning of each objective by all personnel in the system who are responsible for the actualization of the objective.[71]

The November 1971 issue of ERS Circular entitled "Evaluating Administrative/Supervisory Performance" indicated that a limited number of school districts were utilizing a job target or a performance objective type of approach in evaluating administrators. However, the ERS research team did point out that this type of evaluation was beginning to increase in school districts.[72] The increased pressure for performance evaluation was brought about in part by PPB Systems. This fact was pointed out earlier in this chapter.

There was a considerable amount of work done by the theorists and by the developers of the operational PPB models in developing methods for setting performance evaluation in the instructional area. The Western New York model dealt with how to define objectives by developing the following criteria:

1. They must be measurable.
2. They must be time-phased.
3. They must be explicit.
4. They must be realistic.
5. They must relate the system to its environment.
6. They must fit hierarchical order of objectives.[73]

There was no description of how to develop these objectives. The exemplary objectives which had been developed by Kiser were either district wide objectives or related to specific instructional programs. There was no attempt at identifying objectives for the non-instructional program.

---

[71]Chester Kiser and others, (ed.), An Operational Model for the Application of Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems in Local School Districts (Williamsville, New York: The Western New York School Development Council, 1970), mimeographed.

[72]Suzanne K. Stemnock, "Evaluating Administrative/Supervisory Performance," ERS Circular (Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, No. 6, 1971), p. 8.

[73]Kiser, mimeographed.

The RCASBO model ERMS dealt with objectives in much the same way as did the Western New York model. The developers of the ERMS model recognized the importance of performance objectives being stated for all levels of each program. They did not describe any method or technique for setting the performance objectives and evaluation criteria. What discussion did take place emphasized only that the performance objectives should be stated in output terms.[74]

The researcher found three studies which developed techniques for setting performance objectives for non-instructional programs. Crawford described six components in a non-instructional objective. These components were: "(1) rationale, (2) performer, (3) conditions, (4) performance, (5) criteria, and (6) method of measurement."[75] The study done by Crawford also developed exemplary performance objectives and indicators of accomplishment for the business services area.

Alioto and Jungherr, as was mentioned earlier, identified three types of objectives. In discussing support service program objectives, they identified a four step approach for setting objectives. This approach consisted of the following components:

- include a statement of the purpose of the service
- define their relationship to the overall instructional program, if one exists
- establishes the time frame under which it is to be accomplished
- specifies the criteria that will serve as the basis for determining whether or not it has been accomplished.[76]

The process described by Mansergh identified components to be incorporated in each objective as did the other two studies. The Mansergh approach included the following three steps:

1. Identifying major responsibilities.
2. Specifying how performance in each area will be measured.
3. Identifying some reality-based results that will be expected in each area.[77]

This approach was more general in nature compared to the approaches specified by the two studies reported above. The process described by Mansergh resembled more closely the process for setting performance objectives utilized by industry.

---

[74]Curtis, p. 148.

[75]Crawford, pp. 72-73.

[76]Alioto, p. 60.

[77]Mansergh, p. 14.

Functions of the Administrative Services

The purpose of this portion of the review of literature was to establish the parameters of responsibility normally associated with the administrative service area of a school district. In order to accomplish this purpose it was necessary for the researcher to first identify the broad components of the administrative services. After identifying the broad components, the researcher identified the specific functions attached to each broad component.

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) identified three broad programmatic efforts which appear to be found in most school districts. These broad programmatic efforts were (1) instruction, (2) business administration, and (3) general administration.[78] In speaking about the duties of the person who performs the general administration services the AASA said that "the general administrator's chief function is to assist the superintendent in the coordination of administrative services."[79] In the area of administrative services the AASA identified four general areas which might come under the responsibility of the general administrator: (1) improvement of the educational program (included in this broad category was research); (2) selection and development of personnel; (3) management of schools; and (4) working with the community.[80]

Crawford utilized a three broad programmatic effort approach in developing his hypothetical school district. In his study Crawford identified the following as the major functions of the business administration: (1) building and grounds, (2) financial affairs, (3) transportation, and (4) food services.[81]

Based upon what AASA identified as general administration and what the Crawford Study identified as the functions of business administration, the researcher delimited the broad functions of the administrative service area as: (1) research and planning, (2) community relations, and (3) faculty-staff relations.

The purpose of the following discussions was to relate the general tasks performed under each of the following areas: (1) administrative services division, (2) research and planning department, (3) community relations department and, (4) faculty-staff relations department.

---

[78] Profiles of the Administrative Team (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1971), p. 21

[79] Profiles. . .Team, p. 29. [80] Profiles. . .Team, p. 30.

[81] Crawford, p. 178.

Administrative Services Division. As has been mentioned earlier the chief function identified as pertaining to the administrative services division was coordination. It could be hypothesized that the administrative services division would have the major responsibility of coordinating the work of the departments under its control. Some of the major functions mentioned by the AASA were: representing the superintendent on board and citizens committees, general supervisor of board policies, interpreter of the system's programs to lay and professional groups, and coordinate personnel services in the district.[82] The review of literature for this general area revealed that the division's broad objectives should deal with the functions of coordinating and supervising.

Research and Planning Department. The functions which were identified as tasks normally associated with research and planning were: research and long-range planning. Included in the area of research were such tasks as design of experimental programs, evaluation of educational programs, surveys and proposal writing. In the area of long-range planning the researcher identified such tasks as conduction of workshops in long-range planning, projection of future demands upon the school district's resources and development of simulation models to aid in the planning process.

Community Relations Department. The research indicated that the functions of the community relations department could be divided into six broad categories. These were: (1) providing information; (2) acting as liaison officers between the district and the community; (3) planning district elections; (4) scheduling of district facilities; (5) dealing with individual school units in the area of public relations; and (6) management of school publication facilities.

Faculty-Staff Relations Department. In researching the functions of the Faculty-Staff Relations Department the researcher found that the functions tended to divide themselves into three broad functions. These functions were: grievance, negotiations and personnel--certified and non-certified.

---

[82] Profiles. . .Team, p. 30.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research team utilized a jury of experts to validate the tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria. A rating instrument was sent to each jury member. The purpose in developing the rating instrument was twofold: (1) to establish validated performance objectives and evaluation criteria for the administrative services and (2) to serve as verbal models for school districts to follow in establishing objectives and criteria for their particular situation those objectives and criteria which were validated by the jury.

Development of the Rating Instrument

The tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria found in the rating instrument were developed as a result of an examination of related literature and discussions with practicing school administrators. The foundation for the performance objectives and evaluation criteria was discussed in the preceeding section.

Finalization of the Rating Instrument

The tentative performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria were sent to a pilot jury consisting of local practitioners (see Appendix A). The pilot jurors offered suggestions regarding the appropriateness of the objectives and evaluation criteria as well as suggestions for stating more precisely some of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria. Several objectives and criteria were reworded to eliminate the ambiguity which the pilot jury indicated existed. The final rating instrument contained 109 objectives and criteria.

Categories in the rating instrument. The tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria were grouped in the rating instrument according to the hypothetical organizational structure developed by the researcher from the review of literature. The performance objectives and evaluation criteria were placed in the following categories: (1) administrative services divisional objectives, (2) research and planning departmental objectives, (3) community-relations departmental objectives, and (4) faculty-staff relations departmental objectives.

Format used to develop the performance objectives and evaluation criteria. The technique utilized by the researcher in developing the performance objectives and evaluation criteria was developed from the techniques reveiwed in the review of literature. The first step was to identify the functions of the administrative services. The second step was to state the purposes of each function and state these purposes in the form of a task which must be performed by the administrative services. The third step was to state the tasks identified in step two in performance terms and to attach to each a measurement for evaluating if the task was accomplished.

Each of the performance objectives which resulted from step three had to meet certain criteria before they were placed in the rating instrument. Each objective had to possess the following components: (1) the performer, (2) the performance, (3) the criterion or accomplishment level, and (4) the method of measurement.

In developing the performance objectives and evaluation criteria the researcher noted that before many of the objectives could be applied to any one particular district the objectives may require that constraints or conditions be placed upon them. These constraints or conditions would take into account any situations unique to a particular district. Therefore when performance objectives and evaluation criteria have been developed for a particular district the constraints or limiting conditions should be stated in the objective in order to ensure that all parties involved understand the conditions under which the task is being performed and evaluated.

Format for the rating instrument. The rating instrument developed by the researcher consisted of three main divisions. The first division was that of the introduction. The purpose for the introductory remarks was to lay the foundation for the remainder of the rating instrument. Included in the introduction were statements detailing the purposes and rationale behind the study.

The second section contained an explanation of the hypothetical school district along with organizational charts designed to present a graphic representation of the district's organizational structure and the functions performed by the administrative services. This division also included a description of the components found in the performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

The third division of the rating instrument was made up of the 109 tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria. The jurors were requested to rate the performance objectives as appropriate or not appropriate. If an objective was rated appropriate, the jurors were requested to then rate the attendant evaluation criterion as appropriate or not appropriate. For those objectives which contained an exception level, the jurors were to indicate which of the exception levels they would accept and still consider the objective accomplished. The performance objectives and evalution criteria which were offered to the jury were divided into the following categories: (1) administrative services divisional objectives and criteria, (2) research and planning departmental objectives and criteria, (3) community-relations departmental objectives and criteria, and (4) faculty-staff relations departmental objectives and criteria.

Distribution of the Rating Instrument

A jury of experts was used to validate the tentative performance objectives and evaluation criteria contained in the rating instrument. The jury was composed of sixteen experts in the field of school administration. These jurors had been nominated by at

least one of four nationally known experts in the fields of school administration and systems approach to management. These four experts were: (1) Dr. David Novick, Director of the Cost Analysis Department at Rand Corporation; (2) Dr. Harry Hartley, Associate Dean of the School of Education at New York University; (3) Dr. Chester Kiser, Project Coordinator, Title III PPB Project, Western New York School Study Council; and (4) Dr. Terry Eidell of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration (CASEA). These four experts were asked to nominate six or seven individuals whom they felt would be qualified to judge the appropriateness of the objectives and evaluation criteria (see Appendix B).

The request for jury members resulted in sixteen individuals being nominated. A letter was sent to each of the jurors requesting their participation in the study. As a result of that letter, all sixteen jurors expressed a willingness to be involved in the study.

Mailing of the rating instrument. On January 21, 1972, the rating instrument was mailed to each of the sixteen jurors. Enclosed with the rating instrument was a cover letter detailing the procedure to be used in rating the objectives and their attendant evaluation criteria. The cover letter also requested that the rating instrument be returned on or before March 1, 1972.

On March 3, 1972 phone calls were made to those jurors whose rating instrument had not been received. Two of the jurors indicated that they no longer wished to participate in the study. The remaining jurors stated that they would be returning the rating instrument in the near future. One juror never returned the rating instrument. As a result thirteen rating instruments were received and all were useable. This represented 81 percent of the original jury.

Tabulation of the Juror Responses

The directions which were given to the jury indicated that two or three separate types of responses were being sought. The first type of response sought was an indication of the appropriateness of the objective. The second type was a judgement as to the appropriateness of the evaluation criterion. The final type of response was to indicate the minimum or maximum exception levels beyond which performance would not be considered acceptable. This final type of response did not apply to all objectives and criteria as did the first two. The purpose of this section of the chapter was to describe the methods utilized to tabulate the juror responses to the instrument.

Objectives. The jurors were offered the opportunity to indicate by checking the appropriate space whether the objective was appropriate or not appropriate. For a few of the objectives, if the juror indicated that the objective was appropriate, he was asked to indicate the exception level by selecting one of the alternatives listed. The exception

level was utilized by the researcher to save objectives from being considered inappropriate because the juror disagreed with the level of accomplishment.

In order to assure that an objective was not validated by chance, the researcher determined the standard error of proportion for each objective based upon the assumption that all jurors had an equal chance of checking each objective as appropriate or not appropriate. After determining the standard error the researcher identified the confidence interval to assure with 95 percent certainty that the objectives were not validated by chance. This method of validation guaranteed that those objectives rated appropriate by the sample jury would be considered valid by the majority of the entire population of similar jurors. The formula utilized to validate the objectives and a sample computation using a total number of thirteen responses appears below.

$$\left[p + 1.64 \sqrt{pq/N}\right] N$$

$$\left[.5 + 1.64 \sqrt{.5(.5)/13}\right] (13)$$

$$\left[.5 + 1.64 \sqrt{.019231}\right] (13)$$

$$\left[.5 + .2275\right] (13)$$

$$\left[.7273\right] (13)$$

$$9.45$$

p = appropriate = .5

q = not appropriate = .5

N = number of responses

Therefore, an objective which was rated by all thirteen jurors would have had to have at least ten appropriate responses in order to be validated. Table 1 denoted the needed level of appropriate responses in relation to a various number of responses.

Table 1

Percent and Response Level Necessary for Performance Objective Validation at the .05 Level

Total Responses	Percent of Total Responses Needed for Validation	Number of Responses Needed for Validation
8	78.97%	7
9	77.30	7
10	75.93	8
11	74.71	8
12	73.65	9
13	72.73	10

When validating an objective the various exception levels were not dealt with. The section entitled "Establishment of the Exception Level" detailed the procedure employed to establish the exception level for both the objectives and the criteria.

Evaluation criteria. In validating the evaluation criteria attendant to those performance objectives which were accepted, the researcher used the simple majority method. Since it had already been ascertained by the standard error of proportion method which objectives were valid, it was reasonable to assume that if the majority of these experts who favored the validated objective agreed with the attendant cirterion that criterion should be considered validated.

When validating the criteria, as with the objectives, the various exception levels were not dealt with. The researcher considered only the number of appropriate responses when validating the criteria. The following section explained the procedure utilized in establishing an exception level.

Establishment of the exception level. The exception level for those objectives and criteria that utilized one was established by a summation technique. The summation technique permitted a single exception level to be identified and fixed as the performance level for those objectives and criteria requiring one. The exception level indicated the level of accomplishment which the majority of those jurors favoring the validated objectives or criteria felt was appropriate for the objective or criterion. The exception level set limits upon the performer beyond which he could not deviate and still consider that the task was being performed adequately. These limits were set either at a maximum level or at a minimum level. In order for a maximum level to be established, the researcher had to begin tallying the number of responses at the highest limit and working toward the lowest limit. At the level where a majority of the jurors favoring the objective or criterion was found, the researcher established the exception levels; 1 percent or less, 3 percent or less, 5 percent or less and 7 percent or less and if the number of responses at each level were five, three, four, and two respectively, the exception level would be set at 3 percent or less. This level was arrived at by tallying the number of responses from the highest exception level permitted and working toward the lowest level. The point where a majority of the jurors were found was determined to be the validated exception level. This indicated that the maximum that the performance could vary would be 3 percent from the established norm. Below an exemplary maximum exception level has been established.

Tally	Number of Responses	Exception Level
	5	1 percent or less
* 9	3	3 percent or less
6	4	5 percent or less
2	2	7 percent or less

The minimum exception level was established by the same summation technique. For those cases requiring a minimum exception level the researcher began tallying the number of responses at the lowest level of accomplishment and working toward the highest accomplishment level. The level where the majority of the jurors appeared was set as the minimum level of accomplishment for the objective or criterion. Shown below are the results of an exemplary situation where a minimum exception level was being established. In the exemplary situation the varified exception level was identified as 90 percent or more. This meant that performance could not drop below 90 percent and be considered satisfactory. Below an exemplary minimum exception level has been established.

Tally	Number of Responses	Exception Level
	2	100 percent
	4	95 percent or more
** 8	3	90 percent or more
5	5	85 percent or more

* Maximum Exception Level
** Minimum Exception Level

JUROR RESPONSES TO THE PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE DIVISION

Twelve performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria for the administrative services were submitted to the jury for validation. Eight of the twelve performance objectives were considered appropriate by the jurors. Seven of the twelve evaluation criteria were considered appropriate by the jurors. Table 1 indicated the number of appropriate responses necessary for validate an objective. The attendant evaluation criterion was considered appropriate if more than half of those jurors favoring the validated objective considered the criterion appropriate. Table 2 summarized the narrative accompanying the performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

Objective 3.0.1 The Administrative Service Division Will Direct all of its Sub-Departments in the Methods of Management by Objectives

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.0.1.1 as measured by each sub-departments describing _____ percent (or more) of its respective tasks in measurable objectives. Twelve of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was rated appropriate.

Table 2

Juror Responses to the Performance Objectives and Evaluation Criteria for the Administrative Services Division

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.0.1 The Administrative Service Division will direct all of its sub-departments in the methods of Management by Objectives	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.0.1.1 as measured by each sub-departments describing ____ percent (or more) of its respective tasks in measurable objectives.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1 90
3.0.2 The Administrative Service Division will approve each of its sub-department's performance objectives and evaluation criteria for _____ percent (or more) of the assigned tasks for that department	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2 90	3.0.2.1 as measured by agreement between the divisional and respective department directors on _____ percent (or more) performance objectives and evaluation criteria developed by all of the departments in the Administrative Service Division.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 1 90
3.0.3 The Administrative Service Division will supervise and direct all sub-department's programs	A NA Ex. Level 7 6	3.0.3.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of each department's objectives being met.	A NA Ex. Level
3.0.4 The Administrative Service Divisional Director will be responsible for reporting to the superintendent and school board concerning the programs and activities under his direction	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.0.4.1 as measured by his ability to describe and to interpret _____ percent (or more) to the school board the programs and activities of the division.	A NA Ex. Level 5 6

* = validate, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 2 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.0.5 The Administrative Services Division will monitor all critical reports developed by the sub-departments	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.0.5.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the agreed upon critical reports leaving the division approved by the Divisional Director.	A NA Ex. Level 7* 4 95
3.0.6 The Administrative Service Division will compile annual progress reports on the activities of the division and each sub-department	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.0.6.1 as measured by the reports being compiled and presented to the superintendent one month prior to the superintendent's annual report and with _____ lateness allowance.	A NA Ex. Level 8* 3 NO
3.0.7 The Administrative Service Division will develop and up-date, on a yearly basis, a complete five-year plan for its division and sub-departments to be presented to the superintendent and Board of Education by an agreed upon date prior to approval of the annual budget	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.0.7.1 as measured by the presentation of the complete plan to the superintendent and Board of Education by the agreed upon deadline with ____ lateness permitted.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2 NO

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 2 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.0.8 The Administrative Service Division, in conjunction with the district superintendency office and the Instructional Division Director, will set the guidelines and changes for the Community Advisory Committee established by the Community-Relations Department	A NA Ex. Level 9 4	3.0.8.1 as measured by the guidelines and changes being communicated to the Community-Relations Department.	A NA Ex. Level
3.0.9 The Administrative Service Division will communicate the recommendations of the Community Advisory Committee and the division's view of the recommendations to the office of the superintendent	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.0.9.1 as measured by the Administrative Services Division's forwarding the recommendations and the division's view of the recommendation to the office of the superintendent _____ percent (or more) of the time that recommendations are presented by the committee.	A NA Ex. Level 8* 3 100
3.0.10 The Administrative Service Division will monitor all critical reports produced by the Community-Relations Department which are to be distributed to the community	A NA Ex. Level 10* 3	3.0.10.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the agreed upon critical reports distributed with the divisional director's approval.	A NA Ex. Level 7* 2 100

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 2 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.0.11 The Administrative Service Division will monitor all official news releases initiated by the district	A NA Ex. Level 8 5	3.0.11.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the official news releases not being released without the approval of the director of the Administrative Service Division.	A NA Ex. Level
3.0.12 The Director of the Administrative Service Division will approve all requests for assistance which require any man hours by any department under his division	A NA Ex. Level 4 9	3.0.12.1 as measured by all requests being approved in writing by the Director of the Administrative Service Division.	A NA Ex. Level

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Five of the jurors selected 85 percent or more and six selected 90 percent or more. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent.

Objective 3.0.2 The Administrative Service Division Will Approve Each of its Sub-Department's Performance Objectives and Evaluation Criteria for _____ Percent (or more) of the Assigned Tasks for That Department

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Ten of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Five of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, four of the jurors selected 90 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent.

Criterion 3.0.2.1 as measured by agreement between the divisional and respective department directors on _____ percent (or more) performance objectives and evaluation criteria developed by all of the departments in the Administrative Service Division. Ten of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 90 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon the nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent.

Objective 3.0.3 The Administrative Service Division Will Supervise and Direct all Sub-Department's Programs

This objective was rated appropriate by seven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Since the objective was not validated by the jurors no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criteria.

Objective 3.0.4 The Administrative Service Divisional Director Will be Responsible for Reporting to the Superintendent and School Board Concerning the Programs and Activities Under His Direction

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven of the jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.0.4.1 as measured by his ability to describe and to interpret _____ percent (or more) to the school board the programs and activities of the division. Five of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This evaluation criterion was not validated.

Objective 3.0.5 The Administrative Service Division Will Monitor All Critical Reports Developed by the Sub-Departments

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.0.5.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the agreed upon critical reports leaving the division approved by the Divisional Director. Seven of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Each of the jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more and three of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon the seven responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.0.6 The Administrative Service Division Will Compile Annual Progress Reports on the Activities of the Division and Each Sub-Department

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.0.6.1 as measured by the reports being compiled and presented to the superintendent one month prior to the superintendent's annual report and with ____ lateness allowance. Eight of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Each of the jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected two days or less lateness and six selected no lateness. Based upon eight responses the maximum exception level was established at no lateness allowance for the reports.

Objective 3.0.7 The Administrative Service Division Will Develop and Up-date, on a Yearly Basis, a Complete Five-Year Plan for its Division and Sub-Departments to be Presented to the Superintendent and Board of Education by an Agreed Upon Date Prior to Approval of the Annual Budget

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.0.7.1 as measured by the presentation of the complete plan to the Superintendent and Board of Education by the agreed upon deadline with ____ lateness permitted. Eleven of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Each of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected one week or less lateness permitted and eight of the jurors selected no lateness permitted. Based upon eleven responses the maximum exception level was established at no lateness permitted.

Objective 3.0.8 The Administrative Service Division, in Conjunction with the District Superintendency Office and the Instructional Division Director, Will Set the Guidelines and Changes for the Community Advisory Committee Established by the Community-Relations Department

This objective was rated appropriate by nine jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation

based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Since the objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criteria.

Objective 3.0.9 The Administrative Service Division Will Communicate the Recommendations of the Community Advisory Committee and the Division's View of the Recommendations to the Office of the Superintendent

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve of the jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.0.9.1 as measured by the Administrative Service Division's forwarding the recommendations and the Division's view of the recommendation to the office of the superintendent _____ percent (or more) of the time that recommendations are presented by the committee. Eight of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Each of the eight jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and five of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon eight responses the minimum exception level was established at 100 percent.

Objective 3.0.10 The Administrative Service Division Will Monitor all Critical Reports Produced by the Community-Relations Department Which are to be Distributed to the Community

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.0.10.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the agreed upon critical reports distributed with the divisional director's approval. Seven of the ten jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon ten responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Each of the seven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and five of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon seven responses the minimum exception level was established at 100 percent.

Objective 3.0.11 The Administrative Service Division Will Monitor all Official News Releases Initiated by the District

This objective was rated appropriate by eight jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Since the objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criteria.

Objective 3.0.12 The Director of the Administrative Service Division Will Approve all Requests for Assistance Which Require any Man Hours by any Department Under His Direction

This objective was rated appropriate by four jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Since the objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criteria.

JUROR RESPONSES TO THE PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE RESEARCH AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Twenty-nine performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria defining those tasks normally associated with a Research and Planning Department were submitted to the jury for validation. Twenty-eight of the performance objectives were validated utilizing Table 1. Twenty-four of the attendant evaluation criteria were validated. The evaluation criteria were considered appropriate if more than 50 percent of those jurors favoring the validated objective considered the criterion appropriate. Table 3 summarized the narrative accompanying the performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

Objective 3.1.1 The Research and Planning Department Will State the Department's Tasks in Terms of Performance Objectives and Attendant Evaluation Criteria

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.1.1 as measured by agreement between the divisional and departmental directors on _____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria and by the directors signing a formal agreement sheet with each receiving a

Table 3

Juror Responses to the Performance Objectives and Evaluation Criteria for the Research and Planning Department

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.1 The Research and Planning Department will state the department's tasks in terms of performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria	A NA Ex. Level 13*	3.1.1.1 as measured by agreement between the divisional and departmental directors on _____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria and by the directors signing a formal agreement sheet with each receiving a copy of the finalized performance objectives and evaluation criteria.	A NA Ex. Level 9* 3 90
3.1.2 The Research and Planning Department will accomplish _____ percent (or more) of the agreed upon performance objectives	A NA Ex. Level 11* 0 90	3.1.2.1 as measured by at least _____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives being met as judged by the established criteria.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 1 90
3.1.3 The Research and Planning Department will assist in the preparation and development of all proposals seeking financial assistance from outside sources	A NA Ex. Level 10* 2	3.1.3.1 as measured by a record showing at least _____ man hours (or more) devoted to each proposal submitted by the school district to an outside agency and no legitimate complaints sighting lack of assistance.	A NA Ex. Level 4 6

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 3 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.4 The Research and Planning Department at the request of the Administrative Service Division will develop proposals for funded projects	A NA Ex. Level 9* 3	3.1.4.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the projects being funded as a result of the proposals prepared by the Research Department.	A NA Ex. Level 3 6
3.1.5 The Research and Planning Department when requested to do so will prepare reports for the Business Service Division on the current trends and educational philosophy behind the current trends in school buildings	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.5.1 as measured by the Research Department's ability to prepare a report document with specific locations where the current trends are in operation or a sound rationale for the material in the report. The report will be presented with _____ lateness allowance from the time jointly set by the Director of the Administrative Service Division and the Research Department Director.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 2 2 days
3.1.6 The Research and Planning Department in conjunction with the Instructional Services Division will develop evaluation designs for all experimental instructional programs	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.6.1 as measured by approval of the evaluation design jointly by the Directors of Administrative, Instructional Services, and the Research Planning Department.	A NA Ex. Level 8* 3

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 3 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.7 The Research and Planning Department will assist the Community Relations Department in the development of methods for assessing community needs, demands, feelings, etc.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.7.1 as measured by the department's time and effort report reflecting _____ hours (or more) spent in assisting the Community Relations Department and the survey instrument being developed.	A NA Ex. Level 7* 5 10 hours
3.1.8 The Research and Planning Department will provide resource information that is needed by the Community Relations Department to prepare the budget and bonding elections and/or referendums	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.8.1 as measured by the Research and Planning Department's ability to provide the desired information no later than _____ prior to the beginning of the campaign.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 2 6 weeks
3.1.9 The Research and Planning Department will conduct surveys requested by the superintendent and/or the Administrative Service Divisional Director	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.1.9.1 as measured by the Department's ability to produce the survey requested with _____ lateness allowance from the agreed upon deadline between the Research Director and the superintendent and/or Divisional Director.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 1 5 days

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 3 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.10 The Research and Planning Department at the request of the Director of Administrative Services will serve as advisors to any division or department wishing assistance in the development and construction of evaluative techniques for divisional and/or departmental projects	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.10.1 as measured by the Research and Planning Department's time and effort report specifying _____ hours (or more) spent to assist the various divisions and departments.	A NA Ex. Level 6 6 .
3.1.11 The Research and Planning Department will develop long-range planning procedures for the school districts	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.1.11.1 as measured by the long-range planning procedures being approved by the board of education, the superintendent, and his administrative cabinet.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1
3.1.12 The Research and Planning Department will develop and hold in-service training sessions for the school administrators on the methods and procedures of long-range planning	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.12.1 as measured by the scheduling and holding of _____ or more in-service training sessions on the methods and procedures of long-range planning and by _____ percent or more of the administrators developing long-range plans for their area of responsibility.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 1 3 & 90

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 3 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.13 The Research and Planning Department will assist any administrator wishing assistance in the development of a long-range plan for his area of responsibility	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.1.13.1 as measured by no justifiable complaints because of lack of assistance from the Research and Planning Department and by the Research and Planning Department's time and effort sheet specifying _____ hours or more beyond the in-service training program spent in assisting in long-range planning techniques.	A NA Ex. Level 8* 5 2
3.1.14 The Research and Planning Department will coordinate the development of all long-range planning efforts for all divisions and departments	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.1.14.1 as measured by the submission of a long-range plan for all divisions and departments to the Director of the Administrative Service Division by the Research and Planning Department.	A NA Ex. Level 9* 2
3.1.15 The Research and Planning Department will project the school district enrollment for a five year period	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.1.15.1 as measured by the department including the yearly updated five year enrollment projection figures as part of the long-range plan and the projection being _____ percent (or less) higher or lower than the first projected year's actual enrollment.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2 3

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 3 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.16 The Research and Planning Department will develop a mill levy projection program which will be able to be utilized in projecting future district mill levies for five years	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.1.16.1 as measured by the inclusion of a yearly updated projection being included in the district's yearly long-range plan and the projection being _____ percent (or less) higher than or lower than the actual mill levy for the first projected year.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2 1
3.1.17 The Research and Planning Department will develop simulation models to be utilized in long-range planning	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.1.17.1 as measured by the department's ability to develop a minimum of three alternative methods of accomplishing the district's broad long-range objectives.	A NA Ex. Level 8* 5
3.1.18 The Research and Planning Department will provide any factual data related to negotiations that the school district's negotiating team requests	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.18.1 as measured by the department's ability to provide 100 percent of all data requested by the negotiating team and no variation from the time agreed upon between the departmental director and the negotiating team.	A NA Ex. Level 7* 5

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 3 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.19 The Research and Planning Department will provide assistance in the collection of resource data to all divisions and departments requesting assistance	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.19.1 as measured by a report from the divisional and/or departmental director acknowledging receipt of the data and by no justifiable complaints to Administrative Services Director citing lack of cooperation on the part of the Research and Planning Department.	A NA Ex. Level 9* 3
3.1.20 The Research and Planning Department will adapt a Planning, Programming, Budgeting model which could be implemented in the district	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.1.20.1 as measured by the adapted model being presented and explained to the superintendent and his cabinet and by approval of the plan by the superintendent and his cabinet.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 1
3.1.21 The Research and Planning Department in conjunction with Business Service Division will develop a financial comparison survey which will enable the school district to compare its financial situation with other local districts.	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.1.21.1 as measured by the studies being presented to the Divisional Directors and the Superintendent on a date agreed upon between the two Directors and the Superintendent with ____ lateness allowance.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2 3 days

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 3 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.22 The Research and Planning Department in conjunction with the Business Service Division will develop a means of tying cost to each educational program	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.22.1 as measured by the Research and Planning Department and the Business Service Division jointly publishing a cost analysis study by the date agreed upon by the Directors of Research and Planning and the Business Services.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 1
3.1.23 The Research and Planning Department will present to the Administrative Service Director an annual departmental report detailing those objectives which were met and those which were not including the level of accomplishment for each objective and for those not met, the reason for the objectives not being met	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.23.1 as measured by the report being presented to the Director of the Administrative Service Division no later than June 30th of each year.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 1
3.1.24 The Research and Planning Department will conduct on a yearly basis a survey to determine the school building needs in relation to the student enrollment for a five year period	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.1.24.1 as measured by the report being included in the district's annual long-range plan and a separate copy of the report being presented to the superintendent and the Divisional Directors by the date agreed upon by the directors.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 3 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.25 The Research and Planning Department will assist the Instructional Services Division in the development of a survey instrument on the current status of the proceeding years' high school graduates and will develop procedures for conducting the survey	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.25.1 as measured by the instrument being developed and the survey procedures being presented to the Director of Instructional Services.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0
3.1.26 The Research and Planning Department will develop a data collection system for the development and updating of a district data bank	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.1.26.1 as measured by the development and operationalization of the data system within _____ of the start of the project.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 3 1½ years
3.1.27 The Research and Planning Department will develop and operate an automatic data retrievable system for the purpose of retrieving infromation from the district data bank	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.1.27.1 as measured by the Research and Planning Department's ability to provide any information requested in the data bank within _____ working days or less after the request was received and approved.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 0 2

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 3 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.1.28 The Research and Planning Department will monitor all information collected for the district-wide data bank	A NA Ex. Level 9 4	3.1.28.1 as measured by the Research and Planning Department presenting to the Director of the Administrative Services at least on a quarterly basis a synopsis of the data stored in the District Data Bank.	A NA Ex. Level
3.1.29 The Research and Planning Department will aid all divisions in the interpretation of data generated from studies conducted by the divisions	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.1.29.1 as measured by the interpretation being presented to the divisional director requesting the assistance and by no justifiable complaints because of lack of assistance.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 2

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

copy of the finalized performance objectives and evaluation criteria. Nine of the twelve jurors who rated this criterion rated it as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Each of the nine jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 90 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon the nine responses the exception level was established at 90 percent.

Objective 3.1.2 The Research and Planning Department Will Accomplish _____ Percent (or more) of the Agreed Upon Performance Objectives

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of eleven responses was eight. This objective was validated.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, four of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, two of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon the nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent.

Criterion 3.1.2.1 as measured by at least _____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives being met as judged by the established criteria. Ten of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 85 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, two of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon the nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent.

Objective 3.1.3 The Research and Planning Department Will Assist in the Preparation and Development of all Proposals Seeking Financial Assistance From Outside Sources

This objective was rated appropriate by nine jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of twelve responses was nine. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.3.1 as measured by a record showing at least _____ man hours (or more), devoted to each proposal submitted by the school district to an outside agency and no legitimate complaints citing lack of assistance. Four of the ten jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon ten responses was six. This criterion was not validated.

Objective 3.1.4 The Research and Planning Department at the Request of the Director of the Administrative Service Division Will Develop Proposals for Funded Projects

This objective was rated appropriate by nine jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of twelve responses was nine. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.4.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the projects being funded as a result of the proposals prepared by the Research Department. Three of the nine jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon nine responses was five. This criterion was not validated.

Objective 3.1.5 The Research and Planning Department When Requested to do so Will Prepare Reports for the Business Service Division on the Current Trends and Educational Philosophy Behind the Current Trends in School Building

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.5.1 as measured by the Research Department's ability to prepare a report document with specific locations where the current trends are in operation or a sound rationale for the material in the report. The report will be presented with _____ lateness allowance from the time jointly set by the Director of the Administrative Service Division and the Research Department Director. Ten of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was ten. This criterion was validated.

Eight of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected six working days or less, two of the jurors selected two working days or less and three of the jurors selected no lateness allowance. Based upon the eight responses the maximum exception level was established at two working days or less lateness allowance.

Objective 3.1.6 The Research and Planning Department in Conjunction With the Instructional Services Division Will Develop Evaluation Designs for all Experimental Instructional Programs

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.6.1 as measured by approval of the evaluation design jointly by the Directors of Administrative, Instructional Services, and the Research Planning Department. Eight of the eleven jurors who rated this criterion rated it as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.7 The Research and Planning Department Will Assist the Community Relations Department in the Development of Methods for Assessing Community Needs, Demands, Feelings, etc.

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.7.1 as measured by the department's time and effort report reflecting _____ hours (or more) spent in assisting the Community Relations Department and the survey instrument being developed. Seven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Five of the seven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected five hours or more, two of the jurors selected tne hours or more and one juror selected fifteen hours or more. Based upon five responses the minimum exception level was established at ten hours.or more.

Objective 3.1.8 The Research and Planning Department Will Provide Resource Information That is Needed by the Community Relations Department to Prepare the Budget and Bonding Elections and/or Referendums

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.8.1 as measured by the Research and Planning Department's ability to provide the desired information no later than _____ prior to the beginning of the campaign. Ten of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eight of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected ten weeks or earlier, two of the jurors selected six weeks or earlier and three of the jurors selected four weeks or earlier. Based upon eight responses the minimum exception level was established at six weeks or earlier.

Objective 3.1.9 The Research and Planning Department Will Conduct Surveys Requested by the Superintendent and/or the Administrative Service Divisional Director

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.9.1 as measured by the Department's ability to produce the survey requested with _____ lateness allowance from the agreed upon deadline between the Research Director and the superintendent and/or Divisional Director. Ten of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected seven days or less, one juror selected three days or less and three of the jurors selected no lateness allowance. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was set at five days or less lateness allowance.

Objective 3.1.10 The Research and Planning Department at the Request of the Director of Administrative Services Will Serve as Advisors to any Division or Department Wishing Assistance in the Development and Construction of Evaluative Techniques for Divisional and/or Departmental Projects

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.10.1 as measured by the Research and Planning Department's time and effort report specifying _____ hours (or more) spent to assist the various divisions and departments. Six of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was not validated.

Objective 3.1.11 The Research and Planning Department Will Develop Long-Range Planning Procedures for the School Districts

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.11.1 as measured by the long-range planning procedures being approved by the board of education, the superintendent, and his administrative cabinet. Twelve of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.12 The Research and Planning Department Will Develop and Hold In-Service Training Sessions for the School Administrators on the Methods and Procedures of Long-Range Planning

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.12.1 as measured by the scheduling and holding of _____ or more in-service training sessions on the methods and procedures of long-range planning and by _____ percent or more of the administrator developing long-range plans for their area of responsibility. Eleven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Ten of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels detailing the minimum number of in-service training sessions. Six of the jurors selected three or more, two of the jurors selected five or more, one juror selected seven or more and one juror selected nine or more. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at three or more in-service meetings.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels detailing the percent of administrators that should develop long-range

plans as a result of the in-service training. Three of the jurors selected 75 percent or more, one juror selected 85 percent or more, two of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more, and two of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent or more.

Therefore, the two exception levels established for this criterion were a minimum of three in-service meetings being held and a minimum of 90 percent of those administrators attending the meetings developing long-range plans for their areas of responsibility.

Objective 3.1.13 The Research and Planning Department Will Assist any Administrator Wishing Assistance in the Development of a Long-Range Plan for His Area of Responsibility

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.13.1 as measured by no justifiable complaints because of lack of assistance from the Research and Planning Department and by the Research and Planning Department's time and effort sheet specifying _____ hours or more beyond the in-service training program spent in assisting in long-range planning techniques. Eight of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Five of the eight jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected two hours or more and two of the jurors selected eight hours or more. Based upon five responses the minimum exception level was established. at two hours or more.

Objective 3.1.14 The Research and Planning Department will Coordinate the Development of All Long-Range Planning Efforts for All Divisions and Departments

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.14.1 as measured by the submission of a long-range plan for all divisions and departments to the Director of the Administrative Service Division by the Research and Planning Department. Nine of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.15 The Research and Planning Department Will Project the School District Enrollment for a Five Year Period

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.15.1 as measured by the department including the yearly updated five year enrollment projection figures as part of the long-range plan and the projection being _____ percent (or less) higher or lower than the first projected year's actual enrollment. Eleven of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 5 percent or less, three of the jurors selected 3 percent or less and three selected 1 percent or less. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was established at 3 percent or less.

Objective 3.1.16 The Research and Planning Department Will Develop a Mill Levy Projection Program Which Will be Able to be Utilized in Projecting Future District Mill Levies for Five Years

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.16.1 as measured by yearly updated projection being included in the district's yearly long-range plan and the projection being _____ percent (or less) higher than or lower than the actual mill levy for the first projected year. Eleven of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Four of the jurors selected 5 percent or less, one juror selected 3 percent or less and four of the jurors selected 1 percent or less. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was established at 3 percent or less.

Objective 3.1.17 The Research and Planning Department Will Develop Simulation Models to be Utilized in Long-Range Planning

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.17.1 as measured by the department's ability to develop a minimum of three alternative methods of accomplishing the district's broad long-range objectives. Eight of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.18 The Research and Planning Department Will Provide Any Factual Data Related to Negotiations That the School District's Negotiating Team Requests

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.18.1 as measured by the department's ability to provide 100 percent of all data requested by the negotiating team and no variation from the time agreed upon between the departmental director and the negotiating team. Seven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.19 The Research and Planning Department Will Provide Assistance in the Collection of Resource Data to All Divisions and Departments Requesting Assistance

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.19.1 as measured by a report from the divisional and/or departmental director acknowledging receipt of the data and by no justifiable complaints to the Administrative Services Director citing lack of cooperation on the part of the Research and Planning Department. Nine of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.20 The Research and Planning Department Will Adapt a Planning, Programming, Budgeting Model Which Could be Implemented in the District

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.20.1 as measured by the adapted model being presented and explained to the superintendent and his cabinet and by approval of the plan by the superintendent and his cabinet. Ten of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven was six. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.21 The Research and Planning Department in Conjunction With Business Service Division Will Develop a Financial Comparison Survey Which Will Enable the School District to Compare its Financial Situation With Other Local Districts

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.21.1 as measured by the studies being presented to the Divisional Directors and the Superintendent with _____ lateness allowance. Eleven of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected nine working days or less, one juror selected six working days or less, three of the jurors selected three working days or less and four of the jurors selected no lateness allowance. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was established at three working days or less lateness allowance.

Objective 3.1.22 The Research and Planning Department in Conjunction With the Business Service Division Will Develop a Means of Tying Cost to Each Educational Program

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.22.1 as measured by the Research and Planning Department and the Business Service Division jointly publishing a cost analysis study by the date agreed upon by the Director's of Research and Planning and the Business Services. Eleven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was seven. This criteria was validated.

Objective 3.1.23 The Research and Planning Department Will Present to the Administrative Service Director an Annual Departmental Report Detailing Those Objectives Which Were Met and Those Which Were Not Including the Level of Accomplishment For Each Objective and For Those Not Met, the Reason For the Objectives Not Being Met

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.23.1 as measured by the report being presented to the Director of the Administrative Service Division no later than June 30th of each year. Eleven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.24 The Research and Planning Department Will Conduct on a Yearly Basis a Survey to Determine the School Building Needs in Relation to the Student Enrollment for a Five Year Period

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.24.1 as measured by the report being included in the district's annual long-range plan and a separate copy of the report being presented to the superintendent and the Divisional Directors by the date agreed upon by the Directors. Twelve of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.25 The Research and Planning Department Will Assist the Instructional Services Division in the Development of a Survey Instrument on the Current Status of the Preceeding Years' High School Graduates and Will Develop Procedures for Conducting the Survey

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.25.1 as measured by the instruments being developed and the survey procedures being presented to the Director of Instructional Services. All twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.1.26 The Research and Planning Department Will Develop a Data Collection System For the Development and Updating of a District Data Bank

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.26.1 as measured by the development and operationalization of the data system within ____ of the start of the project. Ten of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Four of the jurors selected two years or less, one juror selected one and a half years or less, three jurors selected one year or less and one juror selected six months or less. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was established at one and a half years or less.

Objective 3.1.27 The Research and Planning Department Will Develop and Operate an Automatic Data Retrievable System for the Purpose of Retrieving Information From the District Data Bank

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.27.1 as measured by the Research and Planning Department's ability to provide any information requested in the data bank within _____ working days or less after the request was received and approved. All eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected six working days or less, one juror selected four working days or less and seven of the jurors selected two working days or less. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was established at two working days or less after the request was received and approved.

Objective 3.1.28 The Research and Planning Department Will Monitor All Information Collected For the District-Wide Data Bank

This objective was rated appropriate by nine jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Sine this objective was not validated by the jurors no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criterion.

Objective 3.1.29 The Research and Planning Department Will Aid All Divisions in the Interpretation of Data Generated From Studies Conducted by the Divisions

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.1.29.1 as measured by the interpretation being presented to the divisional director requresting the assistance and by no justifiable complaints because of lack of assistance. Ten of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

JUROR RESPONSES TO THE PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS DEPARTMENT

Thirty-five performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria defining those tasks normally associated with a Community Relations Department were submitted to the jury for validation. Thirty-one of the performance objectives were validated utilizing Table 1. Thirty-one of the attendant evaluation criteria were validated. The evaluation criteria were considered appropriate if

more than 50 percent of those jurors favoring a validated objective rated the attenadnt evaluation criterion as appropriate. Table 4 summarized the narrative accompanying the performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

Objective 3.2.1 The Community-Relations Department Will State in Terms of Specific Performance Objectives and Attendant Evaluation Criteria ____ Percent (or more) of Their Tasks

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Each of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Seven of the jurors selected 85 percent or more and four of the jurors selected 90 percent or more. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 85 percent.

Criterion 3.2.1.1 as measured by agreement between the divisional and departmental directors on ____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria and by the directors signing a formal agreement sheet with each receiving a copy of the finalized performance objectives and evaluation criteria. All eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Each of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, two of the jurors selected 95 percent or more, and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent or more.

Objective 3.2.2 The Community-Relations Department Will Accomplish ____ Percent (or more) of the Agreed Upon Performance Objectives

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total number of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, six of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent.

Table 4

Juror Responses to Performance Objectives and Evaluation Criteria for the Community-Relations Department

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.2.1 The Community-Relations Department will state in terms of specific performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria _____ percent (or more) of their tasks	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2 85	3.2.1.1 as measured by agreement between the divisional and departmental director on _____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria and by the directors signing a formal agreement sheet with each receiving a copy of the finalized performance objectives and evaluation criteria.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 0 90
3.2.2 The Community-Relations Department will accomplish _____ percent (or more) of the agreed upon performance objectives	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1 90	3.2.2.1 as measured by at least _____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives being met as judged by the established criteria.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 1 90
3.2.3 The Community-Relations Department will construct all district news releases and provide the Administrative Service Divisional Director a copy no later than _____ before the scheduled release	A NA Ex. Level 10* 3 2 days	3.2.3.1 as measured by a copy of all news releases being supplied the divisional director no later than _____ prior to the scheduled release date.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 0 2 days

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 4 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.2.4 The Community-Relations Department will develop a schedule for continual news releases to all local mass communication media	A NA Ex. Level 10* 3	3.2.4.1 as measured by the developed schedule being approved by the divisional director and the district superintendent.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 0
3.2.5 The Community-Relations Department will prepare news releases when requested to do so by the superintendent, board of education and/or the three divisional directors	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.2.5.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department's ability to fill ____ percent (or more) of the requests.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 1 100
3.2.6 The Community-Relations Department will develop a schedule for releasing information bulletins to the community	A NA Ex. Level 10* 3	3.2.6.1 as measured by the developed schedule being approved by the divisional director and district superintendent.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 0
3.2.7 The Community-Relations Department with the aid of the superintendent and/or the three divisional directors, will prepare the information bulletins for the community.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.2.7.1 as measured by the information bulletin being ____ days (or less) behind schedule because of unprepared material.	A NA Ex. Level 9* 3 3
3.2.8 The Community-Relations Department will conduct a community survey for the purpose of ascertaining community feelings toward schools	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.2.8.1 as measured by the survey being conducted _____ and the results being reported to the superintendent and the school board.	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0 yearly

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 4 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.2.9 The Community-Relations Department will organize a speakers bureau of school personnel to speak at community functions	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.2.9.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department's ability to fill _____ percent (or more) of the requests for speakers by local community agencies.	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0 90
3.2.10 The Community-Relations Department will notify the community of <u>any</u> public meeting being conducted by the board of education at least _____ prior to the date of the meeting. The Community-Relations Department will utilize <u>all</u> means of mass communication at their disposal	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2 1 week	3.2.10.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department's ability to produce, when asked to do so, copies of the meetings notices and the date on which the notices were released to the public.	A NA Ex. Level 8* 3
3.2.11 The Community-Relations Department will notify the community <u>of</u> <u>any</u> open special meeting conducted by the board of education	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.2.11.1 as measured by the notice being distributed at least _____ prior to the scheduled meeting.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 1 3 days
3.2.12 The Community-Relations Department will organize and facilitate the operations of a Community Advisory Committee	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.2.12.1 as measured by the committee being organized, a meeting schedule being developed, and no more than ____ complaints from the committee members of not receiving assistance from the Community-Relations Department.	A NA Ex. Level 8* 4 5

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 4 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.2.13 The Community-Relations Department will convey all recommendations of the Community Advisory Committee to the Administrative Service Director	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.2.13.1 as measured by the director receiving the minutes of _____ percent (or more) of the meetings and a summary of the reactions of the Community-Relations Department to the meetings.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 1 100
3.2.14 The Community-Relations Department will develop plans for all special elections being conducted by the school district for the passage of bond issues, budgets, building construction, or any special programs being instituted by the district which would need voter approval	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.2.14.1 as measured by the plans being developed and given to the divisional director	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2
3.2.15 The Community-Relations Department will submit the developed campaign plans for all district elections for approval _____ weeks (or earlier) before the plans are presented to the Board of Education	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1 4	3.2.15.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department presenting the plans to the divisional director _____ weeks (or earlier) prior to when the plans are scheduled to be presented to the Board of Education.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0 3
3.2.16 The Community-Relations Department will present all campaign plans to the Board of Education	A NA Ex. Level 10* 3 4	3.2.16.1 as measured by the presentation of the plans being on schedule.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 0

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 4 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.2.17 The Community-Relations Department will provide the community with information on a quarterly basis concerning the amount of revenue the school receives and the amount spent by the school for the educational programs	A NA Ex. Level 7 6	3.2.17.1 as measured by the report being ____ the scheduled time of release.	A NA Ex. Level
3.2.18 The Community-Relations Department, in conjunction with the Research and Planning Department and the Business Services Division, will, on a yearly basis, report to the community a cost-benefit analysis of the district's educational program	A NA Ex. Level 10* 3	3.2.18.1 as measured by the cost-benefit analysis being published and distributed to the local community no more than _____ weeks before the annual budget election or referendum.	A NA Ex. Level 9* 1 3
3.2.19 The Community-Relations Department in cooperation with the Instructional Division, will prepare and distribute information bulletins explaining any new instructional practices and/or policies instituted in a school district	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.2.19.1 as measured by the Administrative Service and Instructional Division directors monitoring the information bulletin before its scheduled release.	A NA Ex. Level 8* 5

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 4 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.2.20 The Community-Relations Department will report to the community on an annual basis the annually revised multi-year comprehensive plan developed jointly by the three broad programmatic divisions of the school district	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.2.20.1 as measured by the plan being released to the public _____.	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0 on schedule
3.2.21 The Community-Relations Department will keep the community informed as to the progress of the negotiations between the Board of Education and the school district personnel	A NA Ex. Level 9 4	3.2.21.1 as measured by the reporting during the negotiations period, the current position of the Board of Education.	A NA Ex. Level
3.2.22 The Community-Relations Department will aid the unit administrators (principals) in developing unit public relations programs	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.2.22 as measured by each educational unit having developed a public relations program and no complaints from the unit administrators of not receiving any cooperation from the Public Relations branch of the Community-Relations Department.	A NA Ex. Level 7* 6
3.2.23 The Community-Relations Department will develop the format of the district's annual report	A NA Ex. Level 10* 3	3.2.23.1 as measured by the annual report which the Community-Relations Department publishes following the developed format.	A NA Ex. Level 9* 1

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 4 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.2.24 The Community-Relations Department will keep an updated file on all news releases and published reports	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0	3.2.24.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce, when asked to do so, any news release or published report over the past two years with _____ percent (or more) of all news releases and/or published reports requested made available.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0 100
3.2.25 The Community-Relations Department will keep an updated file of news media contacts with the working hours, place of employment, and home phone number of all news media personnel that are assigned to cover school and community news	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.2.25.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce any of the above information, when asked to do so, with ____ percent (or more) accuracy.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0 95
3.2.26 The Community-Relations Department will establish a procedure for teachers to provide information to the Community-Relations Department on activities in the classroom which would be of public interest and aid in improving school community relations	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.2.26.1 as measured by records of the information and the action taken on the information by the department being available for the Administrative Service Division director's examination upon request.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 0

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 4 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses			Evaluation Criteria	Responses		
	A	NA	Ex. Level		A	NA	Ex. Level
3.2.27 The Community-Relations Department will notify all local news media _____ in advance of any public school board meeting	12*	1	1 week	3.2.27.1 as measured by a check list indicating which medias were notified, when, and by what means.	12*	0	
3.2.28 The Community-Relations Department will coordinate all after hours use of school facilities	10*	3		3.2.28.1 as measured by a master utilization plan of school facilities being updated on a weekly basis and by the plan being _____ percent (or more) accurate.	10*	0	95
3.2.29 The Community-Relations Department will develop and implement a procedure for the management of a yearly community activities program	13*	0		3.2.29.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department's operation of the community activity program according to the procedures set down in the management plan.	12*	1	
3.2.30 The Community-Relations Department in conjunction with the Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop and update personnel recruitment materials	11*	2		3.2.30.1 as measured by the school district's ability to furnish upon request general information concerning the school district to ____ percent (or more) of the inquiring applicants.	10*	1	95

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 4 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.2.31 The Community-Relations Department will develop and run in-service workshops on public relations policies and techniques for school administrative personnel	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.2.31.1 as measured by ____ or more in-service workshops being judged satisfactory by _____ percent (or more) of the administrators attending the workshop.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 3 3 & 90
3.2.32 The Community-Relations Department will supervise operation of the district's duplicating and printing plant or equipment	A NA Ex. Level 8 5	3.2.32.1 as measured by the department's monitoring and scheduling of _____ percent (or more) request for duplicating and printing service.	A NA Ex. Level
3.2.33 The Community-Relations Department will monitor all district level citizen inquires and complaints	A NA Ex. Level 9 4	3.2.33.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of all district level inquires and complaints being first referred to the Community-Relations Department.	A NA Ex. Level
3.2.34 The Community-Relations Department will develop and run in-service workshops on public relations policies and techniques for the professional staff	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.2.34.1 as measured by ____ (or more) in-service workshops being scheduled and held and by the workshop being judged satisfactory by ____ percent (or more) of the professional staff attending the workshop.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1 3 & 90

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 4 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.2.35 The Community-Relations Department will prepare an evaluation form indicating those performance objectives which were met and those which were not including the level of accomplishment and for those not met the reason for the objectives not being met	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.2.35.1 as measured by the report being presented to the Director of the Administrative Service Division no later than June 30th of each year.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Criterion 3.2.2.1 as measured by at least _____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives being met as judged by the established criteria. Eleven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, four of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more, and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent.

Objective 3.2.3 The Community-Relations Department Will Construct All District News Releases and Provide the Administrative Service Divisional Director a Copy No Later Than _____ Before the Scheduled Release

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Each of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected the day of the news release or earlier, three of the jurors selected two days or earlier, three of the jurors selected four days or earlier and one jurors selected six days or earlier. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at two days before the news release.

Objective 3.2.4 The Community-Relations Department Will Develop a Schedule for Continual News Releases to All Local Mass Communication Media

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.4.1 as measured by the developed schedule being approved by the divisional director and the district superintendent. All ten jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of responses necessary for validation based upon ten responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.5 The Community-Relations Department Will Prepare News Releases When Requested to do so by the Superintendent, Board of Education and/or the Three Divisional Directors

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.5.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department's ability to fill ____ percent (or more) of the requests. Eleven of the twleve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twleve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Ten of the elven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, one jurors selected 90 percent or more, two of the jurors selected 95 percent or more, and five of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon ten requests the minimum exception level was established at 100 percent.

Objective 3.2.6 The Community-Relations Department Will Develop a Schedule for Releasing Information Bulletins to the Community

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.6.1 as measured by the developed schedule being approved by the divisional director and district superintendent. All ten jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon ten responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.7 The Community-Relations Department With the Aid of the Superintendent and/or the Three Divisional Directors, Will Prepare the Information Bulletins for the Community

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.7.1 as measured by the information bulletins being ____ days (or less) behind schedule because of unprepared material. Nine of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Seven of the nine jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated on the rating instrument. Four of the jurors selected three days or less and three of the jurors selected no lateness. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was established at three days or less behind schedule.

Objective 3.2.8 The Community-Relations Department Will Conduct a Community Survey for the Purpose of Ascertaining Community Feeling Towards Schools

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.8.1 as measured by the survey being conducted ____ and the results being reported to the superintendent and the school board. All thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eleven of the thirteen jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Four of the jurors selected every two years or sooner and seven of the jurors selected yearly. Based upon eleven responses the maximum exception level was established at a yearly survey.

Objective 3.2.9 The Community-Relations Department Will Organize a Speakers Bureau of School Personnel to Speak at Community Functions

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.9.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department's ability to fill ____ percent (or more) of the requests for speakers by local community agencies. All thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eleven of the thirteen jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, seven of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent.

Objective 3.2.10 The Community-Relations Department will Notify the Community of Any Public Meeting Being Conducted by the Board of Education at Least _____ Prior to the Date of the Meeting. The Community-Relations Department Will Utilize All Means of Mass Communication at Their Disposal

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Ten of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Six of the jurors selected one week or earlier and four selected one and a half weeks or earlier. Based upon ten responses the masimum exception level was established at one week.

Criterion 3.2.10.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department's ability to produce, when asked to do so, copies of the meetings notices and the date on which the notices were released to the public. Eight of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.11 The Community-Relations Department Will Notify the Community of any Open Special Meeting Conducted by the Board of Education

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.11.1 as measured by the notices being distributed at least ____ prior to the scheduled meeting. Eleven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Ten of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected one day or earlier and nine of the jurors selected three days or earlier. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at three days or earlier prior to the scheduled meeting.

Objective 3.2.12 The Community-Relations Department Will Organize and Facilitate the Operations of a Community Advisory Committee

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.12.1 as measured by the committee being organized, a meeting schedule being developed, and no more than ____ complaints from the committee members of not receiving assistance from the Community-Relations Department. Eight of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Six of the eight jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Four of the jurors selected five complaints or less and two selected no complaints. Based upon six responses the maximum exception level was established at five complaints or less.

Objective 3.2.13 The Community-Relations Department Will Convey All Recommendations of the Community Advisory Committee to the Administrative Service Director

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.13.1 as measured by the director receiving the minutes of ____ percent (or more) of the meetings and a summary of the reactions of the Community-Relations Department to the meetings. Ten of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more, and six of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 100 percent.

Objective 3.2.14 The Community-Relations Department Will Develop Plans for all Special Elections Being Conducted by the School District for the Passage of Bond Issues, Budgets, Building Construction, or any Apecial Programs Being Instituted by the District Which Would Need Voter Approval

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.14.1 as measured by the plans being developed and given to the divisional director for approval. Eleven of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.15 The Community-Relations Department Will Submit the Developed Campaign Plans for all District Elections for Approval ____ Weeks (or earlier) Before the Plans are Presented to the Board of Education

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Each of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Four of the jurors selected two weeks or earlier, two of the jurors selected three weeks or earlier and six of the jurors selected four weeks or earlier. Based upon twelve responses the minimum exception level was established at four weeks or earlier.

Criterion 3.2.15.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department presenting the plans to the divisional director ____ weeks (or earlier) prior to when the plans are scheduled to be presented to the Board of Education. All twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Four of the jurors selected two weeks or earlier, three of the jurors selected three weeks or earlier, and four of the jurors selected four weeks or earlier. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at three weeks or earlier.

Objective 3.2.16 The Community-Relations Department Will Present all Campaign Plans to the Board of Education ____ Weeks (or earlier) Prior to the Beginning of the Campaign

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

All ten of the jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected two weeks or earlier, four of the jurors selected four weeks or earlier and three of the jurors selected six week or earlier. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at four weeks or earlier.

Criterion 3.2.16.1 as measured by the presentation of the plans being on schedule. All ten jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon ten responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.17 The Community-Relations Department Will Provide the Community With Information on a Quarterly Basis Concerning the Amount of Revenue the School Receives and the Amount Spent by the School for the Educational Programs

This objective was rated appropriate by seven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validation. Since this objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criterion.

Objective 3.2.18 The Community-Relations Department, in Conjunction With the Research and Planning Department and the Business Service Division, Will, on a Yearly Basis, Report to the Community a Cost-Benefit Analysis of the District's Educational Program

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.18.1 as measured by the cost-benefit analysis being published and distributed to the local community no more than _____ weeks before the annual budget election or referendum. Nine of the ten jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon ten responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Eight of the nine jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected one week or earlier, two of the jurors selected two weeks or earlier and five of the jurors selected three weeks or earlier. Based upon eight responses the minimum exception level was established at three weeks or earlier.

Objective 3.2.19 The Community-Relations Department in Cooperation With the Instructional Division, Will Prepare and Distribute Information Bulletins Explaining Any New Instructional Practices and/or Policies Instituted in a School District

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.19.1 as measured by the Administrative Service and Instructional Division directors monitoring the information bulletin before its scheduled release. Eight of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.20 The Community-Relations Department Will Report to the Community on an Annual Basis the Annually Revised Multi-Year Comprehensive Plan Developed Jointly by the Three Broad Programmatic Divisions of the School District

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.20.1 as measured by the plan being released to the public _____. All thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Twelve of the thirteen jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Ten of the jurors selected on schedule or earlier and one juror selected no later than one week behind schedule. Based upon twelve responses the maximum exception level was established at the plan being released on schedule.

Objective 3.2.21 The Community-Relations Department Will Keep the Community Informed as to the Progress of the Negotiations Between the Board of Education and the School District Personnel

This objective was rated appropriate by nine jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation

based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Since this objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criterion.

Objective 3.2.22 The Community-Relations Department Will Aid the Unit Administrators (Principals) in Developing Unit Public Relations Programs

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.22.1 as measured by each educational unit having developed a public relations program and no complaints from the unit administrators of not receiving any cooperation from the Public Relations Branch of the Community-Relations Department. Seven of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.23 The Community-Relations Department Will Develop the Format of the District's Annual Report

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of twelve responses was nine. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.23.1 as measured by the annual report which the Community-Relations Department publishes following the developed format. Nine of the ten jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation was six. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.24 The Community-Relations Department Will Keep an Updated File on All News Releases and Published Reports

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of twelve responses was nine. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.24.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce, when asked to do so, any news release or published report over the past two years with _____ percent (or more) of all news releases and/or published reports requested, made available. All twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 90 percent or more, four of the jurors selected 95 percent or more, and six of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 100 percent.

Objective 3.2.25 The Community-Relations Department Will Keep an Updated File of News Media Contacts with the Working Hours, Place of Employment, and Home Phone Number of all News Media Personnel That are Assigned to Cover School and Community News

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.25.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce any of the above information, when asked to do so, with ____ percent (or more) accuracy. All twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Five of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more and five selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.2.26 The Community-Relations Department Will Establish a Procedure for Teachers to Provide Information to the Community-Relations Department on Activities in the Classroom Which Would be of Public Interest and Aid in Improving School Community Relations

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.26.1 as measured by the records of the information and the action taken on the information by the department being available for the Administrative Service Division director's examination upon request. All eleven of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.27 The Community-Relations Department Will Notify all Local News Media _____ in Advance of any Public School Board Meeting

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Ten of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception level indicated in the rating instrument. Six of the jurors selected one day or earlier, three of the jurors selected three days or earlier and one juror selected one week or earlier. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at one day or earlier.

Criterion 3.2.27.1 as measured by a check list indicating which medias were notified, when, and by what means. All twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.28 The Community-Relations Department Will Coordinate All After Hours Use of School Facilities

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.28.1 as measured by a master utilization plan of school facilities being updated on a weekly basis and by the plan being _____ percent (or more) accurate. All ten of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon ten responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Eight of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 90 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and two of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon eight responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.2.29 The Community-Relations Department Will Develop and Implement a Procedure for the Management of a Yearly Community Activities Program

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.29.1 as measured by the Community-Relations Department's operation of the community activity program according to the procedures set down in the management plan. Twelve of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.2.30 The Community-Relations Department in Conjunction With the Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Develop and Update Personnel Recruitment Materials

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.30.1 as measured by the school district's ability to furnish upon request general information concerning the school district to _____ percent (or more) of the inquiring applicants. Ten of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 90 percent or more, four of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and four selected 100 percent. Based upon nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.2.31 The Community-Relations Department Will Develop and Run In-Service Workshops on Public Relations Policies and Techniques for School Administration Personnel

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.31.1 as measured by _____ in-service workshops being scheduled and held and by the workshops being judged satisfactory by _____ percent (or more) of the administrators attending the workshops. Twelve of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Ten of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument detailing the number of in-service workshops to be held. Five of the jurors selected one or more, four of the jurors selected three or more and one juror selected five or more. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at three or more in-service workshops being held.

Ten of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument detailing the percent of satisfied administrators attending the workshops. Three of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more, and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon ten responses the minimum accomplishment level was established at 90 percent (or more).

Therefore the two exception levels established for this criterion were a minimum of three in-service meetings and a minimum of 90 percent of the administrators satisfied with the in-service workshops.

Objective 3.2.32 The Community-Relations Department Will Supervise Operation of the District's Duplicating and Printing Plant or Equipment

This objective was rated appropriate by eight jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Since this objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criterion.

Objective 3.2.33 The Community-Relations Department Will Monitor All District Level Citizen Inquires and Complaints

This objective was rated appropriate by nine jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Since this objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criterion.

Objective 3.2.34 The Community-Relations Department Will Develop and Run In-Service Workshops on Public Relations Policies and Techniques for the Professional Staff

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.34.1 as measured by _____ (or more) in-service workshops being scheduled and held and by the workshop being judged satisfactory by _____ percent (or more) of the professional staff attending the workshop. Twelve of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument detailing the number of in-service workshops that should be held. Three of the jurors selected one or more, four of the jurors selected three or more and two of the jurors selected five or more. Based upon nine responses the minimum exception level was established at three or more.

Nine of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument detailing the percent of the professional staff satisfied with the workshops. Two of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 90 percent or more and two of the jurors selected 95 percent or more.

Therefore, the two minimum exception levels established for this criterion were that three or more in-service workshops should be held and that a minimum of 90 percent of the professional staff should be satisfied with the workshops.

Objective 3.2.35 The Community-Relations Department Will Prepare an Evaluation Form Indicating Those Performance Objectives Which Were Met and Those Which Were Not Including the Level of Accomplishment and for Those Not Met the Reason for the Objectives Not Being Met

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.2.35.1 as measured by the report being presented to the Director of the Administrative Services Division no later than June 30th of each year. All twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

JUROR RESPONSES TO THE PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE FACULTY-STAFF RELATIONS DEPARTMENT

Thirty-three performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria defining those tasks normally associated with a Faculty-

Staff Relations Department were submitted to the jury for validation. Thirty of the performance objectives were validated utilizing Table 1. Twenty-nine of the attendant evaluation criteria were validated. The evaluation criteria were considered appropriate if more than 50 percent of those jurors favoring a validated objective rated the attendant evaluation criterion as appropriate. Table 5 summarized the narrative accompanying the performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

Objective 3.3.1 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will State the Department's Tasks in Terms of Performance Objectives and Attendant Evaluation Criteria

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.1.1 as measured by agreement between the divisional and departmental directors on _____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria and by the directors signing a formal agreement sheet with each receiving a copy of the finalized performance objectives and evaluation criteria. Eleven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Ten of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception leve was established at 90 percent.

Objective 3.3.2 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Maintain an Efficiently Operating Department

This objective was rated appropriate by nine jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Since this objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criteria.

Objective 3.3.3 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Keep the Complete Records of all Employees in a Central File

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Table 5

Juror Responses to Performance Objectives and Evaluation Criteria
for Faculty-Staff Relations Department

Performance Objectives	Responses				Evaluation Criteria	Responses			
	A	NA	Ex.	Level		A	NA	Ex.	Level
3.3.1 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will state the department's tasks in terms of performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria	12*	1			3.3.1.1 as measured by agreement between the divisional and departmental directors on ____ percent (or more) of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria and by the directors signing a formal agreement sheet with each receiving a copy of the finalized performance objectives and evaluation criteria.	11*	1	90	
3.3.2 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will maintain an efficiently operating department	9	4			3.3.2.1 as measured by the attainment of ____ percent (or more) of its specific objectives.				
3.3.3 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will keep the complete records of all employees in a central file	10*	3			3.3.3.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce on call any employee's file (certificated and non-certificated) to authorized personnel and ____ percent (or less) of those files requested being cited as being incomplete.	10*	0	3	

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 5 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.3.4 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will update all employees' files on a yearly basis	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.3.4.1 as measured by the department's yearly distribution during the first week in October of an update form to all employees--certificated and non-certificated and by the department's ability to acquire _____ percent (or more) of the update forms returned.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 0 100
3.3.5 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department in conjunction with all other divisions and departments of the school system will supervise the development of job descriptions	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.3.5.1 as measured by job descriptions having been developed for _____ percent of the jobs, by every division and department.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0 95
3.3.6 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will successfully screen all applicants so that no divisions and/or departments will register complaints that unqualified applicants are being sent for the divisional and/or departmental interview	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.3.6.1 as measured by _____ percent (or less) complaints totally from all divisions and departments concerning unqualified applicants being sent for divisional and departmental interviews.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 0 2
3.3.7 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will conduct all initial interviews of applicants	A NA Ex. Level 9 4	3.3.7.1 as measured by no applicant proceeding to the divisional or departmental interview without having the applicant's folder sent by the Faculty-Staff Relations Department to the respective division or department and the results of the initial interview having been recorded in the applicant's folder.	A NA Ex. Level

Table 5 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.3.8 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will run a reference check on all applicants being recommended for employment	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.3.8.1 as measured by a statement being enclosed in _____ percent (or more) of the applicants' files stating the results of the check.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 0 100
3.3.9 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop a Policy Manual which reflects the general policies developed by the school	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.3.9.1 as measured by the Board of Education's acceptance and approval of the Policy Manual.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2
3.3.10 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will provide each employee of the school district with a copy of that part of the Policy Manual with is pertinent to his specific area	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.3.10.1 as measured by all personnel receiving a copy and _____ percent (or more) of all employees receiving the proper section of the manual.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 0 100
3.3.11 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will annually prepare and publish reports which project manpower needs (long and short-range), turnover studies, recruitment analysis (cost and procedures), personnel action reports, and district comparison studies in the personnel area	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.3.11.1 as measured by the department's ability to have these reports presented to the superintendent on the deadline stipulated with _____ lateness allowance.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0 2 days

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level - Exception level

Table 5 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses			Performance Objectives	Responses		
	A	NA	Ex. Level		A	NA	Ex. Level
3.3.12 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will have available a selection of forms for the instructional area's use in faculty evaluation	12*	1		3.3.12.1 as measured by the instructional area's ability to choose from among the suggested list of forms those most appropriate.	9*	3	
3.3.13 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will provide _____ orientation meetings for all newly employed personnel	12*	1		3.3.13.1 as measured by the orientation meetings being scheduled and held.	12*	0	
3.3.14 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supervise the implementation of the master contracts with the teachers' association and with the non-certificated personnel union	11*	2		3.3.14.1 as measured by _____ of the grievance filed against the district being judicated against the school district in favor of the teacher association and/or non-certificated staff.	3	8	
3.3.15 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will successfully settle all grievances brought against the school district and/or the school district administration.	7	6		3.3.15.1 as measured by _____ of the grievance being settled at the department level.			
3.3.16 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will successfully recruit qualified faculty and staff personnel	13*	0		3.3.16.1 as measured by _____ percent of the school district's employees being assigned to positions for which they have been trained and/or certified.	12*	1	95

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 5 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.3.17 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will have all the next year's vacancies that are known by April 30th and filled by June 30th	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.3.17.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the vacancies being filled by June 30th.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0 95
3.3.18 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will have all the next year's vacancies that are known after April 30th filled by the opening day of school	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.3.18.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the vacancies being filled.	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0 95
3.3.19 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop and continually update the guidelines for the fair dismissal of school employees	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.3.19.1 as measured by every administrator possessing a copy of the guidelines and update.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 3
3.3.20 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will conduct a minimum of two in-service workshops for administrators on working within the constraints of the dismissal guidelines	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.3.20.1 as measured by the scheduling and completion of the two workshops prior to the first week of school and by _____ cases or less filed against the school district being dismissed dismissal policies and regulations by an administrator.	A NA Ex. Level 9* 3 2
3.3.21 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will circulate among the school employees a listing of current vacancies, a job description and the minimum qualifications necessary for each vacancy	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.3.21.1 as measured by every vanancy being listed on a circular and each vacancy being accompanied with a description of the job and the minimum qualifications necessary for the position.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0

*= validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 5 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.3.22 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department in conjunction with the Research and Planning Department in order to improve the professional staff's competencies, will develop and hold at least _____ in-service workshops a year on topics current to education	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0 3	3.3.22.1 as measured by the workshops being scheduled and held on topics which the research department has identified as most pressing.	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0
3.3.23 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop transfer policies and procedures for the school personnel	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.3.23.1 as measured by the publication and distribution of such policies and procedures in the district policy manual.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 0
3.3.24 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supply all employees with sufficient information to understand the benefits i.e., social security, health retirement plan, etc.	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.3.24.1 as measured by the department's ability to answer all questions pertaining to these benefits or being able to find out the information sought by the inquiring employee.	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 5 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses			Evaluation Criteria	Responses		
	A	NA	Ex. Level		A	NA	Ex. Level
3.3.25 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supply the negotiating team with information concerning the number of employees on each step of the salary scale	12*	1		3.3.25.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce the information on ____ days' notice with ____ percent accuracy as measured by the current information contained in the employees' records.	12*	0	3 & 100
3.3.26 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supply the negotiating team with the number of employees receiving each of the different benefits and the cost to the district of each of the benefits	12*	1		3.3.26.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce the requested information within ____ days and with ____ percent (or more) of accuracy in the information.	12*	0	3 & 95
3.3.27 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supply the negotiating team with the district's pupil-teacher ratio and those of the surrounding districts	10*	3		3.3.27.1 as measured by the desired information being supplied in ____ day(s) and with ____ percent (or more) of accuracy in the information.	10*	0	3 & 95
3.3.28 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will organize and produce an employee newsletter to inform the district employees of the events taking place in the district	11*	2		3.3.28.1 as measured by a definite schedule being developed and with ____ percent (or more) accomplishment of the schedule.	10*	1	90

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Table 5 (continued)

Performance Objectives	Responses	Evaluation Criteria	Responses
3.3.29 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop and administer an interview with all employees resigning their position under their own volition in order to ascertain information concerning the operation of the school district	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.3.29.1 as measured by the Director of the Administrative Services approving the interview guide and by ____ percent (or more) returns on the interview guide.	A NA Ex. Level 10* 1 95
3.3.30 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will interview all substitute teachers	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.3.30.1 as measured by the results of the interview being recorded in the substitute's file.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 1
3.3.31 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop and distribute a Substitute Teacher Evaluation Form for use by the building principals	A NA Ex. Level 13* 0	3.3.31.1 as measured by no complaints from the principals of not having received the forms.	A NA Ex. Level 9* 4
3.3.32 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will re-evaluate the list of approved substitutes every two months based on the Substitute Teacher Evaluation Form returned by the principals	A NA Ex. Level 11* 2	3.3.32.1 as measured by those substitutes receiving more than ____ negative evaluations by principals being deleted from the list.	A NA Ex. Level 8* 3 2
3.3.33 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will provide the list of approved substitutes to the substitute answering service	A NA Ex. Level 12* 1	3.3.33.1 as measured by the answering service not having to request the revised monthly list.	A NA Ex. Level 11* 1

* = validated, A = appropriate, NA = not appropriate, Ex. Level = exception level

Criterion 3.3.3.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce on call any employee's file (certificated and non-certificated) to authorized personnel and ____ percent (or less) of those files requested being cited as being incomplete. All ten jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon ten responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected five or less, seven of the jurors selected 3 percent or less and one juror selected no part being incomplete. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was established at 3 percent or less of the files being incomplete.

Objective 3.3.4 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Update all Employees' Files on a Yearly Basis

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.4.1 as measured by the department's yearly distribution during the first week in October of an update form to all employees--certificated and non-certificated and by the department's ability to acquire ____ percent (or more) of the update forms returned. All eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Ten of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 90 percent or more, two of the jurors selected 95 percent or more, and seven of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at 100 percent.

Objective 3.3.5 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department in Conjunction With All Other Divisions and Departments of the School System Will Supervise the Development of Job Descriptions

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.5.1 as measured by job descriptions having been developed for ____ percent of the jobs, by every division and department. All twelve of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 85 percent or more, two of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, three of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and five of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.3.6 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Successfully Screen All Applicants so That no Divisions and/or Departments Will Register Complaints That Unqualified Applicants are Being Sent For the Divisional and/or Departmental Interview

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.6.1 as measured by _____ percent (or less) complaints totally from all divisions and department concerning unqualified applicants being sent for divisional and departmental interviews. All eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One jurors selected 5 percent or less, two fo the jurors selected 4 percent or less, five of the jurors selected 2 percent or less and one juror selected no complaints. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was established at 2 percent or less complaints concerning unqualified applicants.

Objective 3.3.7 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Conduct All Initial Interviews of Applicants

This objective was rated appropriate by nine jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validated. Since this objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criterion.

Objective 3.3.8 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Run a Reference Check on All Applicants Being Recommended for Employment

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical numberof appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.8.1 as measured by a statement being enclosed in ____ percent (or more) of the applicants' files stating the results of the check. All eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Ten of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, one juror selected 95 percent or more and seven of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established to be 100 percent.

Objective 3.3.9 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Develop a Policy Manual Which Reflects the General Policies Developed by the School Board

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.9.1 as measured by the Board of Education's acceptance and approval of the Policy Manual. Eleven of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.10 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Provide Each Employee of the School District With a Copy of That Part of the Policy Manual Which is Pertinent to His Specific Area

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.10.1 as measured by all personnel receiving a copy and _____ percent (or more) of all employees receiving the proper section of the manual. All eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the eleven jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and seven of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 100 percent.

Objective 3.3.11 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Annually Prepare and Publish Reports Which Project Manpower Needs (Long and Short-Range), Turnover Studies, Recruitment Analysis (Cost and Procedures), Personnel Action Reports, and District Comparison Studies in the Personnel Area

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.11.1 as measured by the department's ability to have these reports presented to the superintendent on the deadline stipulated with _____ lateness allowance. All twelve of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One jurors selected six days or less, one juror selected four days or less, four of the jurors selected two days or less and five of the jurors selected no lateness allowance. Based upon eleven responses the maximum exception level was established at two days or less lateness allowance.

Objective 3.3.12 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Have Available a Selection of Forms for the Instructional Area's Use in Faculty Evaluation

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.12.1 as measured by the instructional area's ability to choose from among the suggested list of forms those most appropriate. Nine of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.13 The Facutly-Staff Relations Department Will Provide _____ Orientation Meetings For All Newly Employed Personnel

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Eleven of the jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected four or less, three of the jurors selected three or less, and six of the jurors selected two or less. Based upon eleven responses the maximum exception level was established at two or less orientation meetings.

Criterion 3.3.13.1 as measured by the orientation meetings to be scheduled and held. All twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.14 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Supervise the Implementation of the Master Contracts With the Teacher Association and With the Non-Certificated Personnel Union

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.14.1 as measured by _____ of the grievances filed against the district being judicated against the school district in favor of the teacher association and/or non-certificated staff. Three of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was not validated.

Objective 3.3.15 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Successfully Settle All Grievances Brought Against the School District and/or the School District Administration

This objective was rated appropriate by seven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was not validation. Since this objective was not validated no analysis was made of the attendant evaluation criterion.

Objective 3.3.16 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Successfully Recruit Qualified Faculty and Staff Personnel

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.16.1 as measured by _____ percent of the school district's employees being assigned to positions for which they have been trained and/or certified. Twelve of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated on the rating instrument. Five of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 95 percent or more, and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.3.17 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Have all the Next Year's Vacancies that are Known by April 30th Filled by June 30th

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.17.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the vancancies being filled by June 30th. All twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Ten of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Two of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, five of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and two of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.3.18 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Have All the Next Year's Vacancies That are Known After April 30th Filled by the Opening Day of School

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.18.1 as measured by _____ percent (or more) of the vacancies being filled. All thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Twelve of the thirteen jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 90 percent or more, six of the jurors selected 95 percent or more, and five of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon twelve responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.3.19 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Develop and Continually Update the Guidelines for the Fair Dismissal of School Employees

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.19.1 as measured by every administrator possessing a copy of the guidelines and update. Ten of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.20 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Conduct a Minimum of Two In-Service Workshops for Administrators on Working Within the Constraints of the Dismissal Guidelines

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.20.1 as measured by the scheduling and completion of the two workshops prior to the first week of school and by _____ cases or less filed against the school district being dismissed because of failure to follow proper dismissal policies and regulations by an administrator. Nine of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eight of the nine jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Seven of the jurors selected two or less and one juror selected no case filed being dismissed. Based upon eight responses the maximum exception level was established at two or less.

Objective 3.3.21 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Circulate Among the School Employees a Listing of Current Vacancies and a Job Description and the Minimum Qualifications Necessary for Each Vacancy

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.21.1 as measured by every vacancy being listed on a circular and each vacancy being accompanied with a description of the job and the minimum qualifications necessary for the position. All twelve of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.22 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department in Conjunction With the Research and Planning Department in Order to Improve the Professional Staff's Competencies, Will Develop and Hold at Least _____ In-Service Workshops a Year on Topics Current to Education

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Ten of the thirteen jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Seven of the jurors selected three or more, two of the jurors selected five or more and one juror selected nine or more. Based upon ten responses the minimum exception level was established at three or more in-service workshops.

Criterion 3.3.22.1 as measured by the workshops being scheduled and held on topics which the research department has identified as most pressing. All thirteen of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.23 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Develop Transfer Policies and Procedures for the School Personnel

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.23.1 as measured by the publication and distribution of such policies and procedures in the district policy manual. All twelve of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.24 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Supply all Employees With Sufficient Information to Understand the Benefits i.e., Social Security, Health Retirement Plan, etc.

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.24.1 as measured by the department's ability to answer all questions pertaining to these benefits or being able to find out the information sought by the inquiring employee. Twelve of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.25 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Supply the Negotiating Team With Information Concerning the Number of Employees on Each Step of the Salary Scale

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.25.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce the information on _____ days' notice with _____ percent accuracy as measured by the current information contained in the employee's records. All twelve of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels detailing the amount of advance notice indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected five days' or less notice, five of the jurors selected three days' or less notice and five of the jurors selected one days' notice. Based upon eleven responses the maximum exception level was established at three days' or less notice.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels detailing the percent of accuracy of the information indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 90 percent or more,

four of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and six of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 100 percent.

Therefore, the two exception levels established for this criterion were that the information should be supplied within three days' notice and with 100 percent accuracy.

Objective 3.3.26 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Supply the Negotiating Team With the Number of Employees Receiving Each of the Different Benefits and the Cost to the District of Each of the Benefits

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.26.1 as measured by the department's ability to produce the requested information within _____ days and with _____ percent (or more) of accuracy in the information. All twelve of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This objective was validated.

Eleven of the twelve jurors selected one of the exception levels detailing the number of days within which the information should be available. Two of the jurors selected five days or less, five of the jurors selected three days or less and two of the jurors selected two days or less. Based upon eleven responses the maximum exception level was established at three days or less.

Eleven of the twelve jurors also selected one of the exception levels detailing the percent of accuracy indicated in the rating instrument. Seven of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and four of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon eleven responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Therefore, the two exception levels established for this criterion were that the information be available within two days after the request and with 95 percent accuracy.

Objective 3.3.27 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Supply the Negotiating Team With the District's Pupil-Teacher Ratio and Those of the Surrounding Districts

This objective was rated appropriate by ten jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.27.1 as measured by the desired information being supplied in _____ day(s) and with _____ percent (or more) of accuracy in the information. All ten of the jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon ten responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels detailing the amount of time within which the information should be supplied. Two of the jurors selected five days or less, five of the jurors selected three days or less and two of the jurors selected one day. Based upon nine responses the maximum exception level was established at three days or less.

Nine of the ten jurors also selected one of the exception levels detailing the percent of accuracy indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 90 percent or more, four of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and four of the jurors selected 100 percent. Based upon nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.3.28 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Organize and Produce an Employee Newsletter to Inform the District Employees of the Events Taking Place in the District

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.28.1 as measured by a definite schedule being developed and with _____ percent (or more) accomplishment of the schedule. Ten of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. Three of the jurors selected 85 percent or more, two of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, three of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 90 percent.

Objective 3.3.29 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Develop and Administer an Interview With All Employees Resigning Their Position Under Their Own Volition in Order to Ascertain Information Concerning the Operation of the School District

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation

based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.29.1 as measured by the Director of Administrative Services approving the interview guide and by ____ percent (or more) returns on the interview guide. Ten of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Nine of the ten jurors selected one of the exception levels indicated in the rating instrument. One juror selected 85 percent or more, three of the jurors selected 90 percent or more, four of the jurors selected 95 percent or more and one juror selected 100 percent. Based upon nine responses the minimum exception level was established at 95 percent.

Objective 3.3.30 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Interview All Substitute Teachers

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.30.1 as measured by the results of the interview being recorded in the substitute's file. Eleven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.31 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Develop and Distribute a Substitute Teacher Evaluation Form for use by the Building Principals

This objective was rated appropriate by thirteen jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.31.1 as measured by no complaints from the principals of not having received the forms. Nine of the thirteen jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon thirteen responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

Objective 3.3.32 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Re-evaluate the List of Approved Substitutes Every Two Months Based on the Sbustitute Teacher Evaluation Form Returned by the Principals

This objective was rated appropriate by eleven jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.32.1 as measured by those substitutes receiving more than ____ negative evaluations by principals being deleted from the list. Eight of the eleven jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon eleven responses was six. This criterion was validated.

Six of the eight jurors selected one of the exceptionlevels indicated in the rating instrument. Five of the jurors selected more than two and one juror selected more than six negative evaluations. Based upon six responses the maximum exception level was established at more than two negative evaluations.

Objective 3.3.33 The Faculty-Staff Relations Department Will Provide the List of Approved Substitutes to the Substitute Answering Service

This objective was rated appropriate by twelve jurors. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon a total of thirteen responses was ten. This objective was validated.

Criterion 3.3.33.1 as measured by the answering service not having to request the revised monthly list. Eleven of the twelve jurors rated this criterion as appropriate. The critical number of appropriate responses necessary for validation based upon twelve responses was seven. This criterion was validated.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions presented in this study were extracted from findings of the study. The conclusions were of two types: those not resulted from the primary purpose of the study and those resulting from the secondary purpose of the study.

Conclusion Resulting from the Primary Purpose

The conclusion resulting from the primary purpose of the study was that those performance objectives and evaluation criteria validated by the jury of experts were exemplary. The exemplary objectives were divided into the following divisions: (1) Administrative Services, (2) Research and Planning, (3) Community Relations, and (4) Faculty-Staff Relations.

Administrative Services. The following validated performance objectives and evaluation criteria were concluded to be exemplary for the Administrative Services Division.

1. The Administrative Services Division will direct all of its sub-departments in the methods of management by objectives as measured by each sub-department describing 90 percent (or more) of its respective tasks in measurable objectives.

2. The Administrative Service Division will approve each of its sub-department's performance objectives and evaluation criteria for 90 percent (or more) of the assigned tasks for that department as measured by

agreement between the divisional and respective department's directors on 90 percent (or more) performance objectives and evaluation criteria developed by all of the departments in the Administrative Service Division.

3. The Administrative Service Divisional Director will be responsible for reporting to the superintendent and school board concerning the programs and activities under his direction.

4. The Administrative Service Division will monitor all critical reports developed by the sub-departments as measured by 95 percent (or more) of the agreed upon critical reports leaving the division approved by the Divisional Director.

5. The Administrative Service Division will compile annual progress reports on the activities of the division and each sub-department as measured by the reports being compiled and presented to the superintendent one month prior to the superintendent's annual report and with no lateness allowance.

6. The Administrative Service Division will develop and update, on a yearly basis, a complete five-year plan for its division and sub-departments to be presented to the Superintendent and Board of Education by an agreed upon date prior to approval of the annual budget as measured by the presentation of the complete plan to the Superintendent and Board of Education by the agreed upon deadline with no lateness permitted.

7. The Administrative Services Division will communicate the recommendations of the Community Advisory Committee and the division's view of the recommendations to the office of the superintendent as measured by the Administrative Services Division's forwarding the recommendations and the division's view of the recommendation to the office of the superintendent 100 percent of the time that recommendations are presented by the committee.

8. The Administrative Services Division will monitor all critical reports produced by the Community-Relations Department which are to be distibuted to the community as measured by 100 percent of the agreed upon critical reports distributed with the divisional director's approval.

Research and Planning. The following validated performance objectives and evaluation criteria were concluded to be exemplary for the Research and Planning Department:

1. The Research and Planning Department will state the department's tasks in terms of performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria as measured by agreement between the divisional and departmental directors on 90 percent (or more) of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria and by the directors signing a formal agreement sheet with each receiving a copy of the finalized performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

2. The Research and Planning Department will accomplish 90 percent (or more) of the agreed upon performance objectives as measured by at least 90 percent (or more) of the performance objectives being met as judged by the established criteria.

3. The Research and Planning Department will assist in the preparation and development of all proposals seeking financial assistance from outside sources.

4. The Research and Planning Department at the request of the Director of the Administrative Service Division will develop proposals for funded projects.

5. The Research and Planning Department when requested to do so will prepare reports for the Business Service Division on the current trends and educational philosophy behind the current trends in school buildings as measured by the Research Department's ability to prepare a report document with specific locations where the current trends are in operation or a sound rationale for the material in the report. The report will be presented with two working days or less lateness allowance from the time jointly set by the Director of the Administrative Service Division and the Research Department Director.

6. The Research and Planning Department in conjunction with the Instructional Services Division will develop evaluation designs for all experimental instructional programs as measured by approval of the evaluation design jointly by the Directors of Administrative, Instructional Services, and the Research and Planning Department.

7. The Research and Planning Department will assist the Community Relations Department in the development of methods for assessing community needs, demands, feelings, etc. as measured by the department's time and effort report reflecting ten hours (or more) spent in assisting the Community Relations Department and the survey instrument being developed.

8. The Research and Planning Department will provide resource information that is needed by the Community Relations Department to prepare the budget and bonding elections and/or referendums as measured by the Research and Planning Department's ability to provide the desired information no later than six weeks (or earlier) prior to the beginning of the campaign.

9. The Research and Planning Department will conduct surveys requested by the superintendent and/or the Administrative Service Divisional Director as measured by the department's ability to produce the survey requested with five days or less lateness allowance from the agreed upon deadline between the Research Director and the Superintendent and/or Divisional Director.

10. The Research and Planning Department at the request of the Director of Administrative Services will serve as advisors to any division or department wishing assistance in the development and construction of evaluative techniques for divisional and/or departmental projects.

11. The Research and Planning Department will develop long-range planning procedures for the school districts as measured by the long-range planning procedures being approved by the board of education, the superintendent, and his administrative cabinet.

12. The Research and Planning Department will develop and hold in-service training sessions for the school administrators on the methods and procedures of long-range planning as measured by the scheduling and holding of three or more in-service training sessions on the methods and procedures of long-range planning and by 90 percent or more of the administrators developing long-range plans for their area of responsibility.

13. The Research and Planning Department will assist any administrator wishing assistance in the development of a long-range plan for his area of responsibility as measured by no justifiable complaints because of lack of assistance from the Research and Planning Department and by the Research and Planning Department's time and effort sheet specifying two hours or more beyond the in-service training program spent in assisting in long-range planning techniques.

14. The Research and Planning Department will coordinate the development of all long-range planning efforts for all divisions and departments as measured by the submission of a long-range plan for all divisions and departments to the Director of the Administrative Service Division by the Research and Planning Department.

15. The Research and Planning Department will project the school district enrollment for a five year period as measured by the department including the yearly updated five year enrollment projection figures as part of the long-range plan and the projection being 3 percent (or less) higher or lower than the first projected year's actual enrollment.

16. The Research and Planning Department will develop a mill levy projection program which will be able to be utilized in projecting future district mill levies for five years as measured by the inclusion of a yearly updated projection being included in the district's yearly long-range plan and the projection being 1 percent (or less) higher than or lower than the actual mill levy for the first projected year.

17. The Research and Planning Department will develop simulation models to be utilized in long-range planning as measured by the department's ability to develop a minimum of three alternative methods of accomplishing the district's broad long-range objectives.

18. The Research and Planning Department will provide any factual data related to negotiations that the school district's negotiating team requests as measured by the department's ability to provide 100 percent of all data requested by the negotiating team and no variation from the time agreed upon between the departmental director and the negotiating team.

19. The Research and Planning Department will provide assistance in the collection of resource data to all divisions and departments requesting assistance as measured by a report from the divisional and/or departmental director acknowledging receipt of the data and by no justifiable complaints to the Administrative Services Director citing lack of cooperation on the part of the Research and Planning Department.

20. The Research and Planning Department will adapt a Planning, Programming, Budgeting model which could be implemented in the district as measured by the adapted model being presented and explained to the superintendent and his cabinet and by approval of the plan by the superinte ent and his cabinet.

21. The Research and Planning Department in conjunction with the Business Service Division will develop a financial comparison survey which will enable the school district to compare its financial situation with other local districts as measured by the studies being presented to the Divisional Directors and the Superintendent with three working days or less lateness allowance.

22. The Research and Planning Department in conjunction with the Business Service Division will develop a means of tying cost to each educational program as measured by the Research and Planning Department and the Business Service Division jointly publishing a cost analysis study by the date agreed upon by the Directors of Research and Planning and the Business Service.

23. The Research and Planning Department will present to the Administrative Service Director an annual departmental report detailing those objectives which were met and those which were not including the level of accomplishment for each objective and for those not met, the reason for the objectives not being met as measured by the report being presented to the Director of the Administrative Service Division no later than June 30th of each year.

24. The Reserach and Planning Department will conduct on a yearly basis a survey to determine the school building needs in relation to the student enrollment for a five year period as measured

by the report being included in the district's annual long-range plan and a separate copy of the report being presented to the superintendent and the Divisional Directors by the date agreed upon by the directors.

25. The Research and Planning Department will assist the Instructional Services Division in the development of a survey instrument on the current status of the preceeding year's high school graduates and will develop procedures for conducting the survey as measured by the instruments being developed and the survey procedures being presented to the Director of Instructional Services.

26. The Research and Planning Department will develop a data collection system for the development and updating of a district data bank as measured by the development and operationalization of the data system within one and half years of the start of the project.

27. The Research and Planning Department will develop and operate an automatic data retrievable system for the purpose of retrieving information from the district data bank as measured by the Research and Planning Department's ability to provide any information requested in the data bank within two working days or less after the request was received and approved.

28. The Research and Planning Department will aid all divisions in the interpretation of data generated from studies conducted by the divisions as measured by the interpretation being presented to the divisional director requesting the assistance and by no justifiable complaints because of lack of assistance.

Community-Relations. The following validated performance objectives and evaluation criteria were concluded to be exemplary for the Community-Relations Department.

1. The Community-Relations Department will state in terms of specific performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria 85 percent (or more) of their tasks as measured by agreement between the divisional and departmental directors on 90 percent (or more) of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria and by the directors signing a formal agreement sheet with each receiving a copy of the finalized performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

2. The Community-Relations Department will accomplish 90 percent (or more) of the agreed upon performance objectives as measured by at least 90 percent (or more) of the performance objectives being met as judged by the established criteria.

3. The Community-Relations Department will construct all district news releases and provide the Administrative Service Divisional Director a copy no later than two days or earlier before the scheduled release as measured by a copy of all news releases being supplied the divisional director no later than two days (or earlier) prior to the scheduled release date.

4. The Community-Relations Department will develop a schedule for continual news releases to all local mass communication media as measured by the developed schedule being approved by the divisional director and the district superintendent.

5. The Community-Relations Department will prepare news releases when requested to do so by the superintendent, board of education and/or the three divisional directors as measured by the Community-Relations Department's ability to fill 100 percent of the requests.

6. The Community-Relations Department will develop a schedule for releasing information bulletins to the community as measured by the developed schedule being approved by the divisional director and district superintendent.

7. The Community-Relations Department with the aid of the superintendent and/or the three divisional directors, will prepare the information bulletins for the community as measured by the information bulletins being three days (or less) behind schedule because of unprepared material.

8. The Community-Relations Department will conduct a community survey for the purpose of ascertaining community feeling towards schools as measured by the survey being conducted yearly and the results being reported to the superintendent and the school board.

9. The Community-Relations Department will organize a speakers bureau of school personnel to speak at community functions as measured by the Community-Relations Department's ability to fill 90 percent (or more) of the requests for speakers by local community agencies.

10. The Community-Relations Department will notify the community of <u>any</u> public meeting being conducted by the board of education at least one week (or earlier) prior to the date of the meeting. The Community-Relations Department will utilize <u>all</u> means of mass communication at their disposal as measured by the Community-Relations Department's ability to produce, when asked to do so, copies of the meetings notices and the date on which the notices were released to the public.

11. The Community-Relations Department will notify the community of <u>any</u> <u>open</u> special meeting conducted by the board of education as measured by the notice being distributed at least three days or earlier prior to the scheduled meeting.

12. The Community-Relations Department will organize and facilitate the operations of a Community Advisory Committee as measured by the committee being organized, a meeting schedule being developed, and no more than five complaints from the committee members of not receiving assistance from the Community-Relations Department.

13. The Community-Relations Department will convey all recommendations of the Community Advisory Committee to the Administrative Service Director as measured by the director receiving the minutes of 100 percent of the meetings and a summary of the reactions of the Community-Relations Department to the meetings.

14. The Community-Relations Department will develop plans for all special elections being conducted by the school district for the passage of bond issues, budgets building construction or any special programs being instituted by the district which would need voter approval as measured by the plans being developed and given to the divisional director for approval.

15. The Community-Relations Department will submit the developed campaign plans for all district elections for approval four weeks (or earlier) before the plans are presented to the Board of Education as measured by the Community-Relations Department presenting the plans to the divisional director three weeks (or earlier) prior to when the plans are scheduled to be presented to the Board of Education.

16. The Community-Relations Department will present all campaign plans to the Board of Education four weeks (or earlier) prior to the beginning of the campaign as measured by the presentation of the plans being on schedule.

17. The Community-Relations Department, in conjunction with the Research and Planning Department and the Business Service Division, will, on a yearly basis, report to the community a cost-benefit analysis of the district's educational program as measured by the cost-benefit analysis being published and distributed to the local community no more than three weeks before the annual budget election or referendum.

18. The Community-Relations Department in cooperation with the Instructional Division, will prepare and distribute information bulletins explaining any new instructional practices and/or policies instituted in a school district as measured by the Administrative Service and Instructional Division directors monitoring the information bulletin before its scheduled release.

19. The Community-Relations Department will report to the community on an annual basis the annually revised multi-year comprehensive plan developed jointly by the three broad programmatic divisions of the school district as measured by the plan being released to the public on schedule or earlier.

20. The Community-Relations Department will aid the unit administrators (principals) in developing unit public relations programs as measured by each educational unit having developed a public relations program and no complaints from the unit administrators of not receiving any cooperation from the Public Relations Branch of the Community-Relations Department.

21. The Community-Relations Department will develop the format of the district's annual report as measured by the annual report which the Community-Relations Department publishes following the developed format.

22. The Community-Relations Department will keep an updated file on all news releases and published reports as measured by the department's ability to produce, when asked to do so, any news release or published report over the past two years with 100 percent of all news releases and/or published reports requested, made available.

23. The Community-Relations Department will keep an updated file of news media contacts with the working hours, place of employment, and home phone number of all news media personnel that are assigned to cover school and community news as measured by the department's ability to produce any of the above information, when asked to to so, with 95 percent (or more) accuracy.

24. The Community-Relations Department will establish a procedure for teachers to provide information to the Community-Relations Department on activities in the classroom which would be of public interest and aid in improving school community relations as measured by records of the information and the action taken on the information by the department being available for the Administrative Service Division director's examination upon request.

25. The Community-Relations Department will notify all local news media one week (or earlier) in advance of any public school board meeting as measured by a check list indicating which medias were notified, when, and by what means.

26. The Community-Relations Department will coordinate all after hours use of school facilities as measured by a master utilization plan of school facilities being updated on a weekly basis and by the plan being 95 percent (or more) accurate.

27. The Community-Relations Department will develop and implement a procedure for the management of a yearly community activities program as measured by the Community-Relations Department's operation of the community activity program according to the procedures set down in the management plan.

28. The Community-Relations Department in conjunction with the Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop and update personnel recruitment materials as measured by the school district's ability to furnish upon request general information concerning the school district to 95 percent (or more) of the inquiring applicants.

29. The Community-Relations Department will develop and run in-service workshops on public relations policies and techniques for school administrative personnel as measured by three or more in-service workshops being scheduled and held and by the workshops being judged satisfactory by 90 percent (or more) of the administrators attending the workshop.

30. The Community-Relations Department will develop and run in-service workshops on public relations policies and techniques for the professional staff as measured by three (or more) in-service workshops being scheduled and held and by the workshop being judged satisfactory by 90 percent (or more) of the professional staff attending the workshop.

31. The Community-Relations Department will prepare an evaluation form indicating those performance objectives which were met and those which were not including the level of accomplishment and for those not met the reason for the objectives not being met as measured by the report being presented to the Director of the Administrative Service Division no later than June 30th of each year.

Faculty-Staff Relations. The following validated performance objectives and evaluation criteria were concluded to be exemplary for the Faculty-Staff Relations Department.

1. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will state the department's tasks in terms of performance objectives and attendant evaluation criteria as measured by agreement between the divisional and departmental directors on 90 percent (or more) of the performance objectives and evaluation criteria and by the directors signing a formal agreement sheet with each receiving a copy of the finalized performance objectives and evaluation criteria.

2. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will keep the complete records of all employees in a central file as measured by the department's ability to produce on call any employee's file (certificated and non-certificated) to authorized personnel and 3 percent (or less) of those files requested being cited as being incomplete.

3. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will update all employees' files on a yearly basis as measured by the department's yearly distribution during the first week in October of an update form to all employees--certificated and non-certificated and by the department's ability to acquire 100 percent of the update forms returned.

4. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department in conjunction with all other divisions and departments of the school system will supervise the development of job descriptions as measured by job descriptions having been developed for 95 percent of the jobs, by every division and department.

5. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will successfully screen all applicants so that no division and/or department will register complaints that unqualified applicants are being sent for the divisional and/or departmental interview as measured by 2 percent (or less) complaints totally from all divisions and departments concerning unqualified applicants being sent for divisional and departmental interviews.

6. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will run a reference check on all applicants being recommended for employment as measured by a statement being enclosed in 100 percent of the applicants' files stating the results of the check.

7. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop a Policy Manual which reflects the general policies developed by the school board as measured by the Board of Education's acceptance and approval of the Policy Manual.

8. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will provide each employee of the school district with a copy of that part of the Policy Manual which is pertinent to his specific area as measured by all personnel receiving a copy and 100 percent of all employees receiving the proper section of the manual.

9. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will annually prepare and publish reports which project manpower needs (long and short-range), turnover studies, recruitment analysis (cost and procedures), personnel action reports, and district comparison studies in the personnel area as measured by the department's ability to have these reports presented to the superintendent on the deadline stipulated with tow days (or less) lateness allowance.

10. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will have available a selection of forms for the instructional area's use in faculty evaluation as measured by the instructional area's ability to choose from among the suggested list of forms those most appropriate.

11. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will provide two or less orientation meetings for all newly employed personnel as measured by the orientation meetings being scheduled and held.

12. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supervise the implementation of the master contracts with the teacher association and with the non-certificated personnel union.

13. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will successfully recruit qualified faculty and staff personnel as measured by 95 percent of the school district's employees being assigned to positions for which they have been trained and/or certified.

14. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will have all the next year's vacancies that are known by April 30th filled by June 30th as measured by 95 percent (or more) of the vacancies being filled by June 30th.

15. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will have all the next year's vacancies that are known after April 30th filled by the opening day of school as measured by 95 percent (or more) of the vacancies being filled.

16. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop and continually update the guidelines for the fair dismissal of school employees as measured by every administrator possessing a copy of the guidelines and updated.

17. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will conduct a minimum of two in-service workshops for administrators on working within the constraints of the dismissal guidelines as measured by the scheduling and completion of the two workshops prior to the first week of school and by two (or less) cases filed against the school district being dismissed because of failure to follow proper dismissal policies and regulations by an administrator.

18. The Faculty-Staff Department will circulate among the school employees a listing of current vacancies and a job description and the minimum qualifications necessary for each vacancy as measured by every vacancy being listed on a circular and each vacancy being accompanied with a description of the job and the minimum qualifications necessary for the position.

19. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department in conjunction with the Research and Planning Department, in order to improve the professional staff's competencies, will develop and hold at least three in-service workshops a year on topics current to education as measured by the workshops being scheduled and held on topics which the research department has identified as most pressing.

20. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop transfer policies and procedures for the school personnel as measured by the publication and distribution of such policies and procedures in the district policy manual.

21. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supply all employees with sufficient information to understand the benefits i.e., social security, health retirement plan, etc. as measured by the department's ability to answer all questions pertaining to these benefits or being able to find out the information sought by the inquiring employee.

22. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supply the negotiating team with information concerning the number of employees, on each step of the salary scale as measured by the department's ability to produce the information on three day's notice with 100 percent accuracy as measured by the current information contained in the employee's records.

23. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supply the negotiating team with the number of employees receiving each of the different benefits and the cost to the district of each of the benefits as measured by the department's ability to produce the requested information within three days or less and within 95 percent (or more) accuracy in the information.

24. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will supply the negotiating team with the district's pupil-teacher ratio and those of the surrounding districts as measured by the desired information being supplied in three days and with 95 percent (or more) accuracy in the information.

25. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will organize and produce an employee newsletter to inform the district employees of the events taking place in the district as measured by a definite schedule being developed and with 90 percent (or more) accomplishment of the schedule.

26. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop and administer an interview with all employees resigning their position under their own volition in order to ascertain information concerning the operation of the school district as measured by the Director of Administrative Services approving the interview guide and by 95 percent (or more) returns on the interview guide.

27. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will interview all substitute teachers as measured by the results of the interview being recorded in the substitute's file.

28. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will develop and distribute a Substitute Teacher Evaluation Form for use by the building principals as measured by no complaints from the principals of not having received the forms.

29. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will re-evaluate the list of approved substitutes every two months based on the Substitute Teacher Evaluation Form returned by the principals as measured by those substitutes receiving more than two negative evaluations by principals being deleted from the list.

30. The Faculty-Staff Relations Department will provide the list of approved substitutes to the substitute answering service as measured by the answering service not having to request the revised monthly list.

Conclusion Resulting from the Secondary Purpose

The conclusion resulting from the secondary purpose of the study was that the techniques utilized were viable as a model which would aid in the development of performance objectives and evaluation criteria. The components of the model were concluded to be: (1) to identify the functions of the administrative services; (2) to state the purpose of each function and state these purposes in the form of a task; and (3) to state the tasks identified in performance terms and to attach to each a measurement for evaluating if the task was accomplished. The performance objectives developed were composed of: (1) the performer, (2) the performance, (3) the criterion or accomplishment level, and (4) the method of measurement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were based upon conclusions of the study.

1. It is recommended that those districts seeking to implement performance objectives within the district utilize the exemplary performance objectives and evaluation criteria resulting from the study.

2. It is recommended that the model used to develop the exemplary performance objectives and evaluation criteria for this study be employed by any district developing performance objectives.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this section was to relate to the reader a selected number of general observation for implementation which the researcher acquired as a result of conducting the study.

It appears evident to the researcher after extensive research that management by objectives will be one of the vehicles which school personnel will utilize to satisfy the demands for accountability. Increased emphasis in the area of specifically defined behavioral objectives has been evident in the last three or four years. In many instances teacher have begun to define educational programs in terms of behavioral or performance objectives. They have accomplished this task at many different levels--i.e. from specific performance objectives for a particular unit of a course to course and program terminal objectives. Judging from the success of the research reported herein the researcher feels that performance objectives can now be created equally as well for the administrative services as they have been done in the instructional area. Further, it seems reasonable to assume that objectives can be developed at levels lower than those (levels two and three) found in this report since an ability apparently does exist to develop performance objectives for the administrative services with the same quality as in instruction. Appendix C contains a selected number of performance objectives and evaluation criteria developed for a school district's negotiating team. These objectives and criteria were not offered to the jury for validation. They are offered to the reader as suggested performance objectives and evaluation criteria which a school district negotiating team might set.

The researcher would like also to stress that if management by objectives is implemented by a school district the objectives should not be imposed upon the district personnel. The philosophy behind management by objectives is participatory management. Management by objectives appears to operate most effectively if the person who is being evaluated has input into what he is being evaluated on. The system permits an individual to mesh the goals of the organization with his own personal goals and objectives. Management by objectives gives

the manager a more global view of the actual and desired state of the organization. The manager, therefore, is able to visualize himself more clearly both as a member of the organization and as a contributor to the success of the organization.

Perhaps the implementation of a system of management by objectives will bring about a democratizing of the schools. The system if implemented would extend from the superintendent right down to and including the teachers. This system would see another type of negotiation within the schools. Negotiations between superior and subordinates would be on an individual basis. There would be agreement between the involved parties upon what and how a person was to be evaluated.

One final comment which the researcher wishes to make is that management by objectives can be considered not only as part of the controlling function of management but also as part of the planning function. The system permits management to plan their desired state and after working through the prescribed processes a comparison can be made between the actual results and the desired outcomes which were expressed in the forms of performance objectives. If a discrepancy exists the manager has a focal point upon which to develop a prescription to alleviate the discrepancy.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The following general recommendations were based upon the researcher's general observations. These are offered to the reader as recommednations which could be followed when implementing performance objectives into a school system.

1. It is recommended that before a school district implements any or all of the validated objectives and criteria the district adapt the objectives and criteria to fit the particular needs of the school district.

2. It is recommended that the validated objectives and attendant evaluation criteria and/or those adapted from them be ranked in order of the individual district's priority. This must be done so as to meet the goals of each individual district.

3. It is recommended that a management plan be developed which will tie together the owrk done in the three programmatic efforts and which will enable school administrators to evaluate the effectiveness of the objectives.

4. It is recommended that school districts not hesitate to use the validated objectives resulting from this study even if their administrative organizational structure does not coincide with the hypothetical structure used in this study.

5. It is recommended that those school administrators, superior and subordinates, who utilize the exemplary objectives and evaluation criteria resulting from this study agree that the tasks have been adequarely described.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Books

Alkins, Marvin D., and others. Instructional Objectives Exchange. U.C.L.A.: The Center for the Study of Evaluation, June 1966.

Allioto, Robert F. and J.A. Jungherr. Operational PPBS for Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971.

Banghart, Frank W. Educational Systems Analysis. Toronto, Ontario: MacMillan Company, 1969.

Bittel, Lester R. Management by Exception. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1966.

Bolt, William J. Education for the Seventies: A Plan for Action. Palo Alto, California: Monographs for the Seventies, 1970.

Campbell, Roald F. and other. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1971.

Curtis, William H. Educational Resources Management System. Chicago: Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Officials, 1971.

Davis, Donald E. and Neal C. Nickerson. Critical Issues in School Personnel Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1968.

Dapper, Gloria. Public Relations for Educators. New York: MacMillian Company, 1964.

Drucker, Peter. Managing for Results. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1964.

_____. The Practice of Management. New: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954.

Flanagan, John C., William M. Shaner, and Robert F. Mager. Behavioral Objectives: Language Arts, Science, Social Studies, Mathematics. Palo Alto: Westinghouse Learning Press, 1971. Four Volumes.

Garvue, Robert J. Modern Public School Finance. Toronto, Ontario: MacMillan Company, 1969.

Gibson, Oliver R. and Harold C. Hunt. The School Personnel Administrator. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Harral, Stewart. Tested Public Relations for Schools. Norman, Oklahoma: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1952.

Hartley, Harry J. Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Humble John W. (ed.). Management by Objectives in Action. Maindenhead, Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Kibler, Robert J., and others. Behavioral Objectives and Instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.

Knezevich, Stephen, j. (ed.). Administrative Technology and the School Executive. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969.

_____. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969.

Lewis, Anne Chambers. The School and the Press. Washington, D.C.: The National School Public Relations Association, 1965.

Mansergh, Gerald G. Dynamics of Management by Objectives for School Administration. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1971.

McCloskey, Gordon. Education and Public Understanding. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Moehlman, Arthur B. and James A. Van Zwall. School Public Relations. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, Inc., 1957.

Odiorne, George S. Management by Objectives. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1965.

Popham, James and Eva L. Baker. Establishing Instructional Goals. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Profiles of the Administrative Team. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1971.

Shils, Edward and C. Taylor. Teachers, Administrators and Collective Bargaining. New York: Thomas Crowell Company, 1968.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

Tyler, Ralph W. Constructing Achievement Tests. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1934.

Valentine, Raymond. Performance Objectives for Managers. New York: American Management Association, 1966.

Van Zwall, James A. School Personnel Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1964.

2. Periodicals

Berg, Richard D. "Systems Help Educational Planning and Control." Journal of Systems Management. Vol. 21, No. 12, Issue 116, December 1970, pp. 8-13.

Lopez, Felix M. "Accountability in Education." Kappan. Vol. LII, No. 4, December 1970.

"Magniture of the American Educational Establishment, 1969-1970," Saturday Review. Vol. LIII, No. 38, September 19, 1970, p. 67.

Wrightstone, J.W. "The Role of the Research Specialist." Phi Delta Kappa. Vol. XXXV, October 1953.

3. Unpublished Material

Conceptual Design for a Planning, Programming, Budgeting System. California State Department of Education.

Crawford, Thomas S. "The Development of a Model Exemplifying Business Services Objectives and Their Performance Indicators for Educational Program Budgeting." unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Denver, 1971.

Dorsey, John W. "An Overview of Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems." Proceedings of the Twelfth National Conference on School Finance. New Orleans, 1969.

Education-Planning-Programming-Budgeting System: Procedures Manual for School Districts. Government Studies Center, Fels Institute of Local and State Government, University of Pennsylvania, March 1969.

Eidell, Terry L. and John M. Nagle. Program Planning Document for Data-Based Educational Planning Systems. Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1970. (mimeographed).

Foster, Charles W. (ed.). Report of the First National Conference on PPBS in Education. Chicago: Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Officials, 1969.

Kiser, Chester and others, (ed.). An Operational Model for the Application of Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems in Local School Districts. Williamsville, New York: The Western New York Development Council, 1970. (mimeographed).

Management Development Committee. Setting Management Goals and Objectives. Aerospace Systems Division, Bendix Corporation, 1967. (mimeographed).

Mushkin, Selma J. and James R. Cleaveland. "Planning for Educational Development in a Planning, Programming, Budgeting System." Proceedings of the Eleventh National Conference on School Finance. Dallas, 1968.

Novick, David. Origin and History of Program Budgeting. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1966.

Perkins, Joseph A. "PPBS and MIS: Their Role in Managing Education." Proceedings of the Twelfth National Conference on School Finance. New Orleans, 1969.

Shaw, Alvie L. "An Analysis of the Position of Research Director in the Public School System Throughout the Fifty States." unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Denver, 1967.

Stanford Research Institute. Planning, Programming, Budgeting. A Report prepared for the New York City School Board of Education. Stanford: PPBS Staff, Stanford Research Institute, June 1967.

Timiraos, Carmen R. and Katherine A. Bemis. Behavioral Objectives Manual. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Southwestern Cooperative Education Laboratory, Inc., 1970.

4. Miscellaneous

Administrative Assistant in School Relations. Larkspur, California: Tamalpais Union High School District, Job Description.

Administrative Leadership Services. "Communicating with Staff." Washington, D.C.: Administrative Leadership Service, 1967.

Assistant to the Superintendent Information Services. Palo Alto: California, Illustrations of Key Duties, No. 6.

Bliss, Sam W. The Extent and Utilization of Management Information Systems and Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems in State Education Agencies. Denver: Improved State Leadership in Education, 1971.

"Educational Accountability Act of 1971." Section 1, Chapter 123, Colorado Revised Statues 1963, Article 41, 1971.

Educational Research Service. Research Units in Local School Systems. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Circular No. 5, July 1965.

Personnel Administrator: Position Description. Greenwich, Connecticut: Greenwich Public School, 1972.

"Proposal for Developing Program-Planning-Budgeting-Evaluation System Design." A proposal for research and related activities submitted to the Office of Education by the Dade County Public Schools and the Research Corporation of the Association of School Business Officials.

Responsibility of School Publications Department. Tuscon, Arizona: Tuscon Public Schools.

Stemnock, Suzanne K. "Evaluation Administrative/Supervisory Performance." ERS Circular. Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, No. 6, 1971.

_____. "The School Public Relations Administrator 1970-71." ERS Circular. Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, No. 3, 1971.

APPENDIX A

PILOT JURORS

Dr. Eugene A. Albo
Director, Personnel
Aurora Public Schools
1085 Peoria Street
Aurora, Colorado 80010

Dr. William G. Altimari
Assistant Superintendent, Administrative Services
Littleton Public Schools
6558 South Acoma Street
Littleton, Colorado 80120

Mr. Ali Joseph
Assistant Superintendent, Personnel
Mapleton Public Schools
591 East 80th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80229

Mr. Thomas H. Pickens
Deputy Superintendent, Facilities and Accounts
Aurora Public Schools
1085 Peoria Street
Aurora, Colorado 80010

Dr. Charles Zartman
Director, Research and Evaluation
Englewood Public Schools
4101 South Bannock Street
Englewood, Colorado 80110

APPENDIX B

LIST OF JURORS

+*** Mr. Richard Berg
Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company
629 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, California

+*** Mr. Gary F. Blanchard
School District of Philadelphia
21st Street South of the Parkway
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

+*** Mr. Brent D. Bradley
Associate Head
Resource Analysis Department
The Rand Corporation
Santa Monica, California 90406

+* Dr. Charles Brewin
School District #81
4835 Michigan Avenue
Schiller Park, Illinois 60176

+*** Dr. Francis Cary
Montgomery County Schools
850 North Washington Street
Rockville, Maryland

+*** Mr. Robert Cross
580-Vialoux Village
3420 Vialoux Drive
Winnipeg 20, Manitoba
Canada

+*** Dr. William H. Curtis
National Academy for School Executives
1201 16th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

+*** Dr. John Greenbaugh
Assistant Superintendent for Business
Fairfield Public Schools
Fairfield, Connecticut

+*** Dr. Frederick W. Hill
Assistant Superintendent
Division Avenue
Hicksville, New York 11801

+*** Dr. Chester Kiser
120A Foster Hall
SUNY at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

+*** Dr. Stephen Knezevich
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

+* Professor Don Levine
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
Canada

+* Professor Erik Lindman
School of Education
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

+*** Dr. John Murphy
99 Aero Drive
Cheektowaga, New York 14225

+*** Mr. Blue Wooldridge
School of Public Administration
University Park - U.C.L.A.
Los Angeles, California 90007

+*** Dr. Roger B. Worner
200 Elizabeth Street
Kanawha County Schools
Charleston, West Virginia 25310

\+ nominated as a juror

* agreed to serve

** returned rating instrument

APPENDIX C

Performance Objectives for the Negotiation Team

Performance Objectives	Evaluation Criteria
1. The negotiating team will successfully conclude the ensuing year's master agreement between the school district and the teachers by the opening of the school year	as measured by the agreement being ratified by the Board of Education and the teachers of the district.
2. The negotiating team will successfully conclude the contract negotiations so as not to exceed the salary and/or fringe benefits limits agreed upon by the board of education and the negotiating team	as measured by the final agreement being within the established limits 100 percent of the time.
3. The negotiating team, the board of education and the administrative advisory team will establish the salary and/or fringe benefits limits beyond which the school district could not make an agreement	as measured by the limits being established three weeks prior to the start of negotiations.
4. The negotiating team, the board of education and the administrative advisory team will develop the initial proposal, a comprehensive plan for conducting the negotiations and setting priorities for each part of the proposal	as measured by the initial proposal being developed and approved by the board of education three weeks prior to the beginning of negotiations.
5. The negotiating team upon receipt of the teachers' proposal will circulate the proposal to all school district administrative personnel for their comments concerning counter proposal	as measured by a copy of the teachers' proposal being circulated to the administrative personnel within two days of receipt and with no justifiable complaints of not receiving a copy of the proposal.

Performance Objectives for the Negotiation Team

Performance Objectives	Evaluation Criteria
6. The negotiating team will incorporate into the school district's plan those suggestions of the administrative personnel which the board of education and the administrative advisory team felt would enhance the school district's position	as measured by the suggestions proposed by the district's administrative personnel being presented by the negotiating team to the school board and the administrative advisory team and a record of action taken by the board and advisory team being available to authorized personnel.
7. The negotiating team will not negotiate any managerial prerogatives which have been identified by the board of education and the district administrative personnel as purely managerial in nature	as measured by the final agreement presented to the board containing no managerial prerogatives being delegated to the teachers.
8. The negotiating team will keep the superintendent and his cabinet informed on the progress of negotiations	as measured by a reporting schedule being developed and adhered to and any emergency reporting taking place when required.
9. The negotiating team will maintain good faith throughout the negotiations	as measured by the negotiations not being interrupted by a justifiable charge of lack of good faith negotiations on the part of the board's representatives.
10. The negotiating team will be prompt at all meetings in order to help to demonstrate good faith	as measured by no complaints from the teacher's association for lateness.
11. The negotiating team will give reasons for all points in the negotiated agreement for which it must say no	as measured by no complaints or grievance cited against the board's representatives for showing lack of good faith in negotiations by not giving reasons for rejecting a proposal presented by the teacher's association.

Performance Objectives for the Negotiation Team

Performance Objectives	Evaluation Criteria
12. The negotiating team will maintain the confidentiality of the negotiations	as measured by no justifiable charge of lack of good faith in the negotiations because of permitting confidential information to be given to unauthorized sources.
13. The negotiating team will present all the factual data necessary for the board to make a decision as to whether to accept or not accept the proposed agreement	as measured by the board of education not having to request the negotiating team gather more factual data concerning the results of implementation of the proposed agreement upon the school district.
14. The members of the negotiating team will conduct themselves according to the procedures agreed upon by the teachers' association and the district's negotiating team	as measured by the negotiations proceeding without being interrupted for failure to follow the established procedures on the part of the district's negotiating team.
15. The negotiating team will maintain complete, accurate, and unambiguous minutes of all negotiation sessions	as measured by the minutes not being cited as incomplete, inaccurate and ambiguous by authorized personnel wishing to review the minutes.